

SCOLDING
NO
SCHOLARSHIP:
IN THE ABYSS
OR,
GROUNDLES GROUNDS
OF

The Protestant Religion, as holden out, by M. Menzeis in his Brawlings against M. Dempster.

[By Alex. Conne]

We have heard of the Pride of Moab (he is very proud) even of his haughtiness , and his Pride and his wrath ; but his lyes shall not be so , *Isaiah 16. v. 6.* According to Protestants Translation. *The house of God, which is the Church of the living God, the Pillar and Ground of Truth, 1 Tim. 3. 15.*

Printed for the Author, 1669.

SCOLLING

NO.



S^r William Baird of Newbairth Bar.

1669

A144

A N
Advertisement.



Having but a very few things
whereof to Advertise the Reader,
I address no Epistle to him;
Yet one thing I must friendly tell
him, being to ask a Courtesie or
two at his hands. 1. Then
he shall know this short Reply to
Mr. Menzeis greater Book, was offered to the Press
at Aberdene within a moneth after it first appear-
ed; but the Stationer being inhibited by Publick
Authority (and that as is thought at M. Menzeis
desire) I was forced first to make it to be transcribed,
and then fitted for abroad, where it is not easie to us,
to have any thing well Printed or returned in hast.
2. I must beg upon this account, the Errata and faults
in Orthography may be excused, I not being present to
correct them. 3. I desire none would think tedi-
ous or superfluous in some Sections, very many

Advertisement.

Quotations, yea some even here and there repeated, for that in questions of fact, things cannot be otherwise proved, and to remit the Reader either to the first Authours of them, or the places wherein they were cited before, or in other Controversie Books, were to divert his thoughts and attention, and put him to such pains as few will take. 4. I pray that he do not mistake me in refuting M. Menzeis Grounds, for I only take to prove, that the Scripture and Doctrine of the Primitive Church can be no ground to Protestants, denying an Infallible Visible Fudge for both these as infallibly propounded by the true Church, I most cordially imbrace, and wish all may do with me.

SECT.

(I)



AN

Answer to a Letter sent from Aberdene, with Mr. John Menzeis his Reply to Mr. Dempster, for Reclaiming a Country Gentleman from Popery.

SIR,



Our Letter shewing equally such zeal for the Protestant Cause, and affection to me, hath made me read the Book inclosed, with such a Character of the Writer, as carefully, as if it contained Responses, and as impartially as if I were a Seeker.

The Question here moved, I ingenuously grant,

B

is

is the main Point (if solidly answered) could best reclaim me, and most of my Profession, who amid'st so many Storms raised against us, have no small motive to comply, if we could look at present to our little Temporal Interest, without making a greater and Eternal loss, whereof there could be no hazard, if Protestants (as is here debated) could shew any assured and infallible ground for what they profess.

This, Sir, is all Mr. *Dempster* through all his ten Papers requires, and we with him; he propounds and states the Question most clearly and smoothly, though in homely terms, by reason of his long absence from home; he makes no Digression from the main Point, what ever be replied beside: (yet engageth after this Point once decided, to answer what ever is here retorted, instanced, or urged against him) he answers humbly and mildly, however provok'd with most bitter and lofty words; Like another *Fabius* or old Warriour, he keeps his Post, neglecting all the Flowrishes and Skirmishes of his insulting Adversary, who having engaged under his hand, to defend the Protestant Religion (the onely occasion of this Dispute) strives still nevertheless (*fide & arte punica*) that is most deceitfully, to impugne the Catholick Roman Faith with a like success to that of *Hannibal*, who let *Carthage* be demolished and reduced to ashes, whilst he insisted in vain to Sack and Ruine
Rome.

Rome. And this is proper to him with most Hereticks; all Heresy tending rather to destruction than edification; Atheisme rather than Religion, and to question what hath been since Christ and his Apostles constantly believed in the Church of God, rather than to settle their own new wavering and inconstant Faith, upon any solid Principle or Ground.

Yet Mr. *Menzies* most confidently thinking he had got as an unbloody, so an undoubted victory (hearing his Adversary was dead) Petitions the Senate of *Aberdene* as for a Triumph, that his Papers may be put in Print: His Learning, Loyalty, and Religion most justly deserving it, for as he is of a daring and stirring spirit, so in all things Martially minded, his Learning being most in Polemics, his Loyalty much in debate, and his Religion ever in controversy; nevertheless as Umpire in all, he deserveth well a Crown, as his late late Victory by the Pen a Chariot of Paper. This his Triumphal Chariot is not drawn, but carried in the Air, with high and violent blasts, most suitable to his fierceness in fighting with a scolding and railing Tongue, which makes his Adversaries deepest wounds. Before it, go indeed some worthy Persons, at least in black upon white, and in the Paper, follow immediately the flying Colours, wherein his late Arms sent from *Edenbrough*, (*viz.* The Bible reversed) do shine, with this new Motto, I take

from the present Subject. The Grounds of the Protestant Religion. The acclamations of the People are not wanting in the mouthes of some fighting Sisters. He is Herauld himself, sounding constantly his own praises aloud; nothing is brought into the Treasury, as in Triumphs had wont in old, but some hundred Marks for the charges of the Triumph (that is, the Printing of the Papers) exported. One thing onely is wanting, practised in such glorious shewes, one Admonitor sitting with the Triumpher, to keep him in mind of humane weakness, least too great honour should so puff him up, as to think himself above the condition of men. And this defect, Sir, I intend to supply, in perusing his Book, advertising him now and then of some weakness, both in Conduct, Courage and Strength; as his Answers to the Question propounded shall deserve.

And first, if I should answer his most inveſtive Babling, Scoldings, and Railings, with all the Venom he spits out to Ciment the Grounds of his Religion, I could easily pay him home, even with the general Applause and Acclamations of most Protestants, amongst whom the more Moderate, and most constant Professors scarce own him, his Religion, or Grounds; as best knowing his Arragant, Proud, Contentious Spirit, his Unbridled Tongue, his scandalous Carriage in so many Encounters, his wavering Belief, unsettled

ferled Faith; and how oft he hath been *Episco-
 pal, Presbyterian, Independent*; His Pulpit jars
 with his Collegue in the time of the Covenant,
 his base compliance with the Usurper in the
 time of Rebellion, his variance with his Bishop
 at the time, the Government of the Church was
 re-establisht; how many living Witnesses have
 heard him Preach and foment Schism, and Divi-
 sions in the Church, Sedition in the State, and
 even treacherous and Treasonable Sermons a-
 gainst his Prince and King. Instance only that
 base and perfidious bewraying of Gods Word,
 belying of the known truths, and betraying of his
 Countrey and King, in that most unchristian
 Sermon, upon these words, *How long wilt thou
 mourn for Saul, whom I have rejected?* Apply-
 ing them to our most Gracious Sovereign; which
 I should have been ashamed to relate, if this no-
 torious Impostor, and most absurd abuser of
 Gods Word, had not first in the Preface of a
 Sermon in Print, and now again so often in this
 his Book most deceitfully and maliciously cryed
 out, *Papists could be no good Subjects*, as if their
 Tenets did tend to Rebellion; whilst all Loyal
 Protestants in the three Kingdoms, both love and
 respect our Loyalty, how ever they hate our
 Profession; and look upon him, with all his Co-
 venanting Fry, as a most fiery Incendiary of Re-
 bellion. Now Sir, if such a man (whom you
 most cry up for his Eloquence, as, if like another

Samson, his strength consisted in his hair) be a Person fitted to give the Grounds of Religion, defend the Protestant Faith, or convert any one to his Belief, for that with a Pharisaical countenance, a Puritanical tone, and a strong voice, colouring some slight Learning and reading of *Pamphlets*, with plagiarious Phrases and Passages, to stuff up a Book in Print, and turn the Glass twice in his Sermons, let any be judge.

As that Philosopher of old, hearing himself praised by the rabble, who commonly approve nothing but such stuff as is in themselves, did presently make an examen of his actions: I hope Protestants seeing their Religion Defended by such a Writer, will more diligently enquire of its weakness, which they can never better see, then in his Papers, where having undertaken to give the Grounds of the Protestant Religion (the only Subject of this Dispute, either by Word or Writ) in them all has not (as his Adversary well re-marks) so much as ten lines to settle, clear, or defend them in the least; but scraping together objections against Catholicks (so often answered by them) borrows some passages to no purpose at present, and heaps up undervaluing words, with such injurious scoldings, railings, and imprecations against an Old, Grave, Learned, and Modest Man, that after he hath called him an impudent Liar, a Knave, Rogue, Sycophant, Fool, a dull and Lethargick-head, a
Neat-

Neat-herd in Ignorance, a Devil in Malice; and what not? He imprecates in fine (out of his corrupt Bible, changing the word *Imperet*, with *insuperet*) the same curse Saint Michael did in their conflict to the Devil, such is the Pride, Passion; and poison of his heart, so contrary to the Spirit of God. After this, what may we expect of such a person, if we hear the Wise mans saying, *In malevolam animam non introibit sapientia* : True Wisdom never enters into a wicked and malicious soul; yet Sir, to satisfie your loving and friendly desire, I intend to examine more at length, what Wit and Learning he shews, and first in his two long Epistles Dedicatory, and to the Reader, which could receive no Answer, from Mr. *Dempster*, as appearing but a twelvemonth after his death: After this, God willing, I wil positively refute (which he so urges may be done) First, his great Principle of *No Infallible visible Judge of Controversie*, and then both his Ruinous Grounds.

B 4 SECT.

 SECT. I.

*Some brief Reflections on the Title
of Mr. Menzei's Book, and
his two long Epistles Dedicatory,
and to the Reader.*

HIS Title being in Latine *Papismus Lucifugus*,
(according to that saying, a strong Thief
shall have a strange name,) must needs be ex-
plained, and surely understood of that New
Gospel Light in the Covenant, for in it Mr.
Menzei was a bright Star of the first Magnitude,
or Fiery Comet himself, of which Light, a Pre-
latick Poet in answer to a *Satyre*, upon the Con-
secration of a Bishop, Writes thus,

*Your Phœbus from the West did rise
A light that did put out mens eyes,
Welcome Confusion.*

This Light indeed Popery shuns, as all other
New Lights against old received Christian Veri-
ties, but not that either of Scripture or An-
tiquity, the onely true Light of the Christian
World,

World, as flowing from Christ the ^{Son} of Justice, and carried by so many holy Popes, Bishops, and Priests in Communion with them, even unto the most remote corners of the Earth, as the conversion of all Kings and Countries to the Christian Religion do testifie, which Light Mr. *Dempster*, no where declines, but constantly holds out to make nothing for clearing the Grounds of the Protestant Religion, except it be in shewing them both ruinous and false, so that Mr. *Menzies* here, *offendit in Luce & in limine*, that is, stumbles both in the light, and in the specious Title of his Book, whereof the very first line is not to the purpose. The Question being only of the Grounds of the Protestant Religion, and not of Popery at all.

He begins with a great show of humility, *who am I, the meanest of the thousands of Israel?* Answer, *Est qui se nequiter humiliat & interiora ejus plena dolo, Eccles. -- 19.* But let his late Bishop in the Church, Principal in the Colledge, and fellow Brethren in the Ministry bear witness of this, when they have opposed him in the least: Yea, his own Jactancy through all his Papers and Book, with his base revilings in every page, and under-valuing of his Adversary. It is those his humble thoughts of his own abilities makes him so boldly assert there was consultation used in the present Dispute, Surprizal intended, and a choice Champion pitched upon to Encounter
with

with him as a Hector. But the known truth is to all them who had a hand in the undertaking (as they did witness in his presence at the Meeting) that they had only yielded to his Importunity in desiring a Meeting, and that they had taken him only who was next at hand for the time, a man most able indeed for a civil Conference, but most unable for a Clamorous Dispute, as being of a very weak Constitution, and of a totally confiscated health. But all this Conference must be set out by him in a disguised Dress; Mr. *Dempster* proclaimed an Ignorant, Catholicks charged with Calumnies, the better to Paint out his Victory and Triumph. As in like case another Conference (as he quotes) by Dr. *Prideaux*, and Dr. *Featly* of late, whom he might have spared to name, being as good at Calumniating Inventions as either of them, and no doubt but he will be cited hereafter, as they now, who nevertheless most deceitfully relates both the occasion of the Conference, and what passed in it.

The clamours of women he speaks of, if any (for it was a most modest person did speak) was onely to suppress his clamours heard even at the Cross, and witness to his face, that he had passed from his engagement to them, which was to give and defend the Grounds of the Protestant Religion, as he had engaged under his hands; and this his missive, was the Paper Mr. *Dempster* kept open at the Meeting (which he would have

generally supposed to have been the first exchanged Paper with him) but it is particularly known to us, *Mr. Dempster* had never then intended to write a line. But *Mr. Menzeis* cautious, and conscious to himself, that it had been easie to reverse his Grounds, and Involve him in inextricable difficulties (as shall hereafter appear) if he had answered directly by word, refuses the performance of his promise, or to speak for the Protestant Religion at all, but will only Impugne some Opinions of Authours in the School, which are neither fit for the Pulpit, (where he did first challenge them) nor the capacity of common hearers, and much less that which he chiefly insisted on, any Point of our Faith.

The first is, That men are not bound presently to repent when ever they have offended God, under the danger of incurring a new sin ; Whereupon *Mr. Menzeis* frameth his Argument, as if this were a Dicision of the Catholick Roman Church ; and then sayes he, *Mr. Dempster* denied the Major, whence he took witness that the Jesuit admitted the Minor, a rare Inference and quick. He passeth under silence the confirmation of the Major denied, because disgraceful to him, who though he did think it a point of Faith, and that so unquestionable, yet could never prove it by Scripture, contenting himself with a weak comparison, which he is ashamed to

to set down in his Book. But however Doctors vary in prescribing a limited time wherein we should repent, all hold the shortest delay both surest and best, and publick Repentance is generally taught to be necessary for publick transgressions, as publick Recantations for open Calumnies, like to that of Mr. Menzies against his Sovereign, *How long wilt thou mourn for Saul, &c.* His Penitential Sermon being as yet to make, so well doth he presently repent. Yea, not only his Practice, but Doctrine also (if truly a Protestant) is so far from presently repenting, that Teaching mens best actions to be sinful, he must either confess repentance at no time to be commanded, or else blasphemously avouch, God hath commanded us to sin. Is it not a jear-ing of Gods Commands, and a scoffing of men, to affirm the Commandements to be impossible, and yet urge that even affirmative ones should be hourly, and instantly kept? Forgetting two Maxims of the School, *Nemo tenetur ad impossibile*, and *Præcepta affirmativa obligant semper sed non pro semper*.

In the second Argument, he both argues and answers to himself, (Mr. Dempster being silenced by his clamours) concerning the intention of Priests in administering the Sacraments, which if requisite, he will have it to make all Faith uncertain. But in vain, there being greater assurance of their intention, then that Ministers

sters use aright the Elements, and pronounce the words, or that they teach not false Doctrine, and set not out corrupt Bibles. The assistance of Gods Spirit promised to his Church, and his particular Providence in Governing and Ruling it, assures us nothing necessary either to Faith or Salvation can be wanting in her; No want of Intention can wrong them who are come to age, they may supply by their own Intentions, Desires, and Acts of the love of God: And for children whom Protestants will have to be saved by the faith of their Parents, and not by Baptism, Is it not more sure, that publick persons in the Church want not a right Intention, then that private men have true Faith? The conferring of a Sacrament is not only *Actio Hominis* I hope, but also *Humana*, as the Divines speak. What then if a Mad man in a frolick, or a Comedian for a jeer, (as we read to have been done in derision of Christians) should pour out water on any one, and pronounce the words? yea, what if a Priest shewing a new Convert how he is to be Baptized, should do the same? Were these lawful and valid Baptisms, where nothing save the Intention is wanting. It is easie to cavil at the chief Heads of the Christian Religion, but hard to say any thing solidly against them.

After this, he comes to his Apologies, First, for so much writing on so little purpose;

An.

Answer, he should have said, so little to the purpose, there scarce being ten lines precisely to the purpose in all his Papers and Book.

Secondly, *That he was not so speedy in Answering as Mr. Dempster, upon his Incombacy's; and upon deliberating whether he should answer, the emptiness of Mr. Dempsters Scriblings, who antedated his Papers, yet that he might guess with Appelles, at his great hast by his foul work.* Answer, his greatest Imcombacy's, as I am informed, are but to dote and declaim *Bellarmines* Objections, or such like, out of other Controversy Books: And if it be an empty Question to ask the Grounds of his Religion; Sure it must be an empty Religion, and void of Grounds. Neither did Mr. *Dempster* Antedate his Papers, but did write back to him as currantly as any man could do a missive Letter, never intending they should see the Press, and finding very little solidity in his Answers. He guesses at his great hast by his foul work, but can shew nothing foul in it, save onely when he resumes his filthy scoldings: but we may easily guess at his little wit by his Foolish Work and Answers no where to the purpose.

His third Apology, is for the Acrimony and bitterness of his expressions, which he says *had their rise from Mr. Dempsters Dunghil Eloquence, Repetitions, Prateritions, Calumnies.* Answer, Mr. *Menzies* scoldings are the only Eloquence

quence of the Dunghil : most Learned men oftentimes be not very Eloquent in the Vulgar Tongue. As to his Repetitions, he is no good Disputant, who passes from his medium before the Argument be answered. For Preteritions, all wise men pass what is not to the purpose, as most of his papers and Book. And as for Calumnies, I leave to his papers to justify his modesty, however Mr. Menzies most injuriously Calumniate him.

In his Epistle to the Reader, he continues his Apologies for *Disputing, Writing, Printing*, granting one might have said more in a very few sheets, for the satisfaction of a lover of Truth, then he in all his Papers, and this is most true; Nay, but he has been constrained to follow the anomalous motions of a tautologizing Jesuit. Answer, These two words set together sound well in a Pulpit, but signifie nothing or little : for how can his motion be anomalous or irregular, who steers still to the same point, constantly propounding the same thing ? Or how can he be said to Tautologize and use idle Repetitions, who insists still in the same question, till he get a full and satisfactory Answer ? as if a man came to require his money from a Debtor, should hear from him many news of the late Wars, and then asking again his money, the Debtor should speak of our new League with many Forraign Princes : But the Creditor still mindful of the
main,

main, did reiterate the occasion of his coming, and ask a new, when he could expect his money? were this a tautologizing, and vain repetition? And in this sense I grant Mr. *Dempster* tautologizes, and in no other.

But are not rather Mr. *Menzies* many Instances in this his Epistle against the Catholick Faith, and so many times repeated in his Book, both tautologies and anomalous motions, as altogether false, frivolous, idle, and impertinent to the present Question, concerning the Grounds of the protestant Religion? wherefore I reflect only on the last, viz. *That Popish Principles, as improven by the Jesuited party, are highly injurious to Princes*, Ergo, The Protestant Religion hath solid grounds; for this should be his Inference in all he sayes: And this an arch Covenanters is not ashamed to write, who so treasonably, and publickly did preach against his lawful Sovereign; but the love and esteem, so many of the Greatest and Wisest Monarches in the Christian World have for Jesuits, sufficiently vindicate them from all the Calumnies of such a disloyal person.

After this he sayes, *If he know his own genius well, he takes no pleasure in altercations*: Answer He is then of a most austere Nature, who so shuns all pleasure; for it seems Mr. *Menzies* lives in altercations, as the *Salamander* in the fire, all his Preachings and Writings being full of them.

He

He delights so to cavil, that he lets not pass Mr. *Dempsters* Orthographick trespasses; which should have been at most imputed to his *Amanuensis* or Scriviner. But, if Mr. *Menzeis* were as Orthodox as Orthographick, all were well. In his voyage to *London* to complement the Usurper, he made himself Orthographick in the *English* Tongue; but coming down an Independent, he was far from an Orthodox mind, yet thinks to keep up some reputation amongst Protestants, by his Imputations on Jesuits.

No hope, sayes he, of prevailing with the Jesuited Faction, whose Design as appears, is to keep up a stated Schism in Christendom, they hinder the conversion of Jews and Infidels. Answer, No Sir; it is only the Hydra of Heresy, and chiefly yours, divided in so many heads, keeps up Schism and Division from the Church, and amongst themselves; which Monster Jesuits strive to suppress, they, yea, one of them, called Saint *Francis Xavier*, hath converted more Infidels to the Christian and Catholick Religion in ten years time, then all the Protestants in the World, for a hundred and fifty, if all Records of History be more worthy of credit, then you. The conversion of Jews, Infidels, Hereticks as ever in old times, so constantly now, is a mark of the true Church, to which Hereticks can no wise pretend, whose business is to pervert Catholicks, rather then to convert Infidels, as Saint *Hierome* well remarks,

so that in all prudence, this he should not have mentioned, his younger brethren the Jansenists, (of whom he borrows most of his Objections against Jesuits) speak not of this, being no little ashamed, when yearly the notable conversions of so many thousand Infidels, only by Jesuits, and other Priests in Communion with the Sea of Rome, come out, wherein neither they, nor he have any hand.

Next amongst many controverted points obstructive to the peace and unity of the Catholick Church, he sets down first, *the Churches Infallibility*, as if the true Church were not infallible, both according to the Scripture and Fathers (as I shall, God willing, hereafter prove at length) or as if the Church being infallible, peace and unity could not be had.

Secondly, the Popes Universal Supremacy, as obstructing Unity, forgetting what St. Hierome sayes, l. 1. in Jovin. *That even amongst the Apostels themselves, one was made head, that the occasion of Schism and Division might be taken away, Ut capite constituto Schismatis tolleretur occasio*: Doth the Popes Supremacy in the whole Church hinder peace and unity, more then my Lord Archbishops Primacy in the Kingdom? Is not this a fling at Bishops in their Diocesses, and the Primate in each Nation, to say their Supremacy over inferiour Pastors, is a let and stop to Peace and Unity in the Church? So all

Co-

Covenanting Ministers speak with him, the Unity they aim at being nothing but a Monopoly to set themselves above Pope and Primate, upon the ruines of both Church and State.

Are not these strong and witty Objections, put in the Frontispiece of his Book, as in the Van? The rest I prosecute not, they being the ordinary controverted Tenets betwixt Protestants and us, answered in every Pamphlet of Controversie; but the last is too remarkable to let it pass: Nay, says he, *Is it not one of the first Queries wherewith Jesuites do assault our people, how do you know Scripture to be the word of God? As if they would have people rather turn Atheists, then remain Protestants.* A very pretty Reply; shews not this his Answer, Jesuits and others have great reason to move the Question, to which so great a Divine can not better reply. Protestants call Scripture their ground of Faith, but can evi-
dence by no sufficient Motive of Credibility, (standing to their principles) this Book they call Scripture, is the true and Authentick Word of God, should not Mr. Menzeis then have settled, cleared, and vindicated from all Objections and Cavils this his ground? but that could have diverted him from Impugning the Romish Faith: no it would have done more against it, then all his Calumnies of Idolatry; being more to the purpose, yea ended, (to the Protestants great advantage) all the present debate, but all Mr.

Menzeis can answer, is to call the question Atheistical, and a demand proper to Infidels; as if good Christians might not ask for Instruction, how they may prudently believe, and firmly adhere to the grounds of their Religion and Faith. In fine, he says, *Many Romanists have called for Reformation.* Answer, true, and do as yet daily call for Reformation in Life and Manners, but not in matters of belief, none of them with Protestants, presuming to correct Gods Word, and reform the Doctrine of his Church, or to censure their Pastors, and all the Ancient Fathers, with Pharisaical, and Puritanical pride. This way of calling for Reformation was proper to protestants at their first rise, for reforming the Catholick Roman Church, and again in the Covenant for the reforming their own; They like Foxes indeed, (to use Mr. *Menzeis* comparison) did raise such dust (not to say worse) with their tails and heads both, that ever since, the very air they breath is infected, and their eyes so blinded, that they cannot open them to see the manifest truth.

After all this, fearing his Book may have a reply, he desires *all things then be noticed he hath said.* Answer, No, this his demand is most unreasonable, that at the time one only question is in debate, and that a main one concerning the Grounds of the Protestant Religion, any thing else should be taken notice of, till this be put to

a closure. On this all the Protestant Religion depends; let their grounds be proved solid, and we have done; for by that we look not on his Digressions as Golden Apples, to make us run out of our way in the least; they being scarce like to the Apples of *Sodom* (in his confused Rapso- dy) that is pleasant to the eye, though no less rotten in the heart, as who has best right to the Root and Tree, may justly claim the Branches and Fruit; so whoever proves he hath the true Grounds of Religion, may easily prove all Superstructures on this ground to be true, the necessary followeth the principal; and this is the chiet and principal question amongst us; let this be once decided in their favour, and we have no more process with them.

Secondly, he desires *nothing be brought has been answered by Protestants.* Answer, if he had given example in this, he had never written a line: However, if any thing has been solidly answered, to what I bring against his great principle, of no Infallible visible Judge of Controversie, or both his grounds, as I most sincerely protest, it never did come to my hands, so let Mr. *Menzeis* send it me, and here an end.

Thirdly, *That personal Criminations be laid aside.* Answer, then these personal Criminati- ons, when he calls Mr. *Dempster* a dull and *Le- thargy-head*, a *Neat-herd*, a man of a *Prostitute* reputation, a *Knave*, a *Sycophant*, a *Devil*, should

have been blotted out of his Book. As Infamous persons are not received for witnesses, so Calumnies can be no wise sooner refuted, then by shewing that he who calumniates has lost all reputation and credit. If it were not softly insinuated, what a quick wit Mr. *Menzeis* is, who names Mr. *Dempster* a dull and Lethargy-head: How learned a Pastor, who calls him a Neat-herd; how famous, who challenges him to be of a prostitute reputation; how honest, who calls him a Rogue and a Knave; how sincere and ingenuous, who terms him a Sycophant: and how great a Saint, who compares him to a Devil; his sole authority in Print might perhaps endanger Mr. *Dempsters* good name, wherefore he must not take ill a little hath been said of this, not for Criminations, but as Answers to Calumnies, and notorious falsehoods; especially his Apology being the greatest of his wrongs, as if Mr. *Dempster* had extorted them, he was forced to it, because for sooth, he can suffer no man to withstand him, or not to be satisfied with what he brings: This is all the Injury we read in Mr. *Dempsters* papers, which can be no excuse certainly to him, who easily foreseeing what might be replied, dare glory with *Job*, he takes injuries for a Crown, citing as a Heroick word in *Luther*, *Indies magis mihi placeo, superbus fio, quod video nomen pessimum mihi crescere.* I please my self more and more daily, yea I be-

come

come proud, to see that I have got a very ill name, and that it grows upon me; which if true, his pleasure may be great, and his pride too, for few of his coat after *Luther* have got a worse name, for changes in Religion, Jars and contentions with his brethren, disobedience to his Bishop, and disloyalty to his Prince.

Here presently to set up his good name a little, he playes the Prophet, striving to pry into Mr. *Dempsters* Intentions and thoughts, why he slighted all the points stated by him, and Instances only that he should prove, there be two Sacraments and no more; but here the Spirit fails him in all his Divinations, the only reason of this being, for that all other controverted Tenets with Protestants are borrowed from divers old condemned Heresies, and this only proper to them.

However, Mr. *Dempster* should have proved seven Sacraments. Answer, No, not this, or any thing else (in the present dispute, as not to the purpose) save only, that Protestants for their Religion could shew no solid ground, this he sticks to, this he insists upon, and this only whilest Mr. *Menzeis* like a Bird ever upon wing flies from branch to branch, a mark of no great Constancy, and Solidity, either in Wit or Learning.

But he will needs bring in the Romish Religion by the head and shoulders upon the Stage, and have Mr. *Dempster* to decline it be tryed by Scrip-

ture, and the Doctrine of the Church in the first three ages. Answer, The Romish Religion has no part in the present Scene, neither is Master Dempster acting any thing directly in defence of it, but Impugning the Protestant grounds, and this Mr. Menzeis in his first answer clearly grants; his words are: *The Thesis—then which we defend, and you impugne is this: The Protestant Religion is the true Religion;* No mention here of the Catholick Roman Faith, and yet Mr. Menzeis in all his papers and Books speaks very little for the Protestant Religion, but always against the Popish, laying aside the Thesis which he sets down himself, as his Text so often in the Pulpit, to rail at random against us.

And this with a like Sincerity and Candor, as when he says, *Quakerism is but Popery under a disguise.* Answer, then most men mistake it, thinking it so far from Popery under what ever disguise, that it is nothing but *Puritanism, in puris naturalibus*, and undisguised. Is the private Spirit our Ground and Guide? Do we allow Laicks and Women to preach? or private persons whatsoever, upon pretence of New Gospel Light to reform the Church? This *Presbyterians* and *Puritans*, in the beginning of the Reformation, and again in the Covenant, did with them: Yea on the same very ground, of adhering to the pure Word, and to the Spirit and Light within them, against all Authority in Church

Church and State; Is not this the *Quakers* chief Argument against Protestants, when they ask their Power and Call: *We are come to Reform you*, say they, *and all your Hirelings*, even as you the *Papists* and *Priests*; *We ground our selves on the pure and naked Word*; *the Spirit speaketh within us*; *we regard not men*; *Church, Councils, Fathers have erred*. Which Answer, Mr. Menzeis if constant to his own principles, with all his Needle-headed Nicities (as he speaks) will hardly refute. In fine, he sayes, *Romanists boast his Papers shall have an Answer*; *these six Moneths might have done it*; *Our Reply will discover we apprehend some dangers, &c.*

Answer, Few Romanists do think his papers deserve a Reply, yea, nor their pains to read them, as saying little to the purpose; much less do they esteem the enterprize to answer them so high, as it should be called a boast: He who rather contends with us in solidity of reason, then celerity of dispatch, will nevertheless have this expected answer six Moneths before his Book did appear, at which time he makes the Magistrates command the Stationer under the highest pains, that he should Print no Reply. Yet after his Book has been a twelve moneth under the Press at home, we may have a Book Printed at a start abroad, neither is there such hast in replying for any danger we apprehend, his railings never having wronged Catholicks in the least, but much

Pro-

Protestants, many whereof have turned *Quakers*, to hear Tub-preachers professing greater Modesty, Sincerity, yea, and Solidity in belief, then he; who by his frequent changes in Religion, from *Prelatiks* to *Presbyterians*, from *Presbyterians* to *Independants*, from *Independants* to I know not whom again, is more like the Weathercock on the Steeple (turning at every wind) then the Member of any one Church.

His Exclamations wherewith he concludes his two long Epistles, are both ludicrous and childish, in misapplying so many Scripture Phrases to the Catholick Roman Church, whose Faith is so highly commended by the Apostle *St. Paul*, and holy Fathers in all Ages; who ever amongst them did tax her of Errour, sie her Communion, renounce her Faith, decline her Censures, question her Authority, disapprove her Doctrine, or chalenge the Supreme power and Headship of her Bishop? In the second age *St. Irenaus* extols her Authority; All Churches (says he, l. 3: c. 3.) round about ought to resort to the Roman Church, by reason of her more powerful Principality. In the third, *St. Cyprian* Ep. 55. calls her *St. Peters Chair*, and the principal Church, to which Infidelity or false Doctrine cannot have access.

In the fourth, *St. Athanasius* has his recourse, both to her Bishop and her, against all his Ad-versa-

versary Hereticks. In the fifth, St. *Augustine* thinks her Sentence an end of Controversie, *Scriptissimus Romam, Roma rescriptum est, questio finita est, &c.* And in following ages do not St. *Gregory*, St. *German*, St. *John Damascene* Venerable *Bede*, St. *Bernard*, St. *Thomas of Aquine*, and generally all the Fathers and Doctors of the Church the same? So that I answer his places of Scripture, as St. *Augustine* Petilian's the Donatist Heretick, l. 2. c. 5. He brings the words of the Law, but takes not heed against whom, as the Devil speaks Scripture to Christ, not discerning to whom. *Verba legis dicitis sed in quos dicitis, non attenditis, sicut Diabolus verba legis dicebat sed cui diceret non agnoscebat.* And with the same St. *Augustine*, I answer to all Mr. *Menzeis* pretended victory and triumph over Mr. *Dempster*.

Facile est ut quisque Augustinum vincat, quanto magis ut vicisse videatur, aut si non videatur, vicisse dicatur facile est, St. Aug. Ep. 174.

SECT.

SECT. II.

Wherein the Question is stated, as propounded by Mr. Dempster, and Mr. Menzeis great Principle and Grounds set down as cleared by him ; with the Design of the Author thereon.

THe sole Argument that I find Mr. *Dempster* urges in all his papers ; in substance runs thus, in this one Syllogism.

That Religion cannot be a true Religion, which hath no peculiar principle or ground to prove that it is a true Religion, and conform to the true sense of the word of God.

But the Protestant Religion hath no peculiar ground or principle to prove it self the true Religion, &c.

Then the Protestant Religion cannot be true.

Mr. *Menzeis* cavils at this Syllogism, as not being in form, both the premises being Negatives, as well as the Conclusion. Mr. *Dempster* Answers, the second is Affirmative, and only ob-
jective-

jectively Negative: As if one should say in Latin (wherein the form of Syllogisms best appears) *Sed omnis Religio Protestantium est talis, ut nullum habeat peculiare fundamentum quo se probet veram*, or else, *Est habens nullum peculiare fundamentum*, &c. which the least Logician in the Colledge presently sees to be an Affirmative Proposition: And yet what Clamours hath not Mr. Menzeis made for this? as if at the first bout he had disarmed his Adversary: So well this great Professor of Divinity is versed in Logick, that he cannot resolve and answer a proposition, if not set down as to a Bajan: Like to that young man who lately came from the Fencing-School, and hardly put to it, mistaking the thrust, is put off his Guard, and so both wounded and mocked.

So the Syllogism standing in good Form, the first Proposition in it suffers no debate. The second is denied by Protestants, whereupon they are required to produce this peculiar Ground which proves their Religion to be true. Master Menzeis after many Wheelings, Turnings, and Windings in his Scoldings, Digressions, Retorsions, at the end brings two grounds for the Protestant Religion. *The first Scripture, and that clear in Fundamentals, or things necessary to Salvation. The second, its agreement in Essentials, with the Faith of the purest and most ancient Primitive Church, in the first three Centuries or Ages.*

To clear his first Ground (which in his sixth paper he storms to have called his *Achilles* or strength, seeing he had given another, which it seems he holds no less strong then it) he sets down, *That all Scriptures are not clear: Secondly, that Protestants do not exclude means of Interpretation. Thirdly, by perspicuity, he understands in Terms, or by firm and clear consequence. Fourthly, that by this perspicuity again, he means an External and objective Evidence which is nothing impeached, by the misunderstanding of Hereticks or others. Fifthly, that by things necessary, is here understood, whether necessary as means, or as commands. What he cites in his eighth paper, as Maxims taken out of George Scholarius a Grecian, is but to the same purpose with what he hath formerly said.*

One onely thing I add, which he urges most in all his Book, that though Protestants do not exclude means of Interpretation in explaining of Scripture, and in deducing consequences from it, yet no necessity there is, that we should know that he who gives the true Interpretation and Sense, have the assistance of the Holy Ghost, because forsooth, *this savours rankly (says he) of that Erroneous Popish Tenet, concerning the necessity of an infallible visible Judge of Controversie: whereof he proves in his third paper there is none, for that a Jurist without any such Infallible assistance, may be known to explain aright*

a Municipal Law, and a Mathematician to demonstrate a Proposition of Euclides.

This is the state of the Question, as propounded by Mr. *Dempster*, and this in substance is Mr. *Menzeis* Answer to it, their debate is long; Mr. *Dempster* constantly putting Mr. *Menzeis* to it, that he would prove these Grounds to be peculiar to Protestants, and support their Controverted Tenets with us; but this he still declines to bring any Positive proof for either, desiring his adversary should rather Positively prove the contrary. No says Mr. *Dempster*, make good your Assertion, as he who affirms should prove; I will not be so put off of my *medium*, I have taken against you: Let us see the Grounds you build on in the sence you take them, and without any Infallible visible Judg of Controversie, assuring you either of the uncorrupt Writings, and sincere Doctrine of the Fathers in the first three ages, or of the uncorrupt Letter, and genuine sence of Scripture, first, to be solid and Infallible, and then to agree peculiarly to you, and the business is done. You confidently assert both; but what Sectary says not the same? their claim to the foresaid Grounds, say ye, is meerly pretended; rests to see how your own is proved as just. Many Digressions and Retortions against Popery are made. Many Protestant Writers spoken of who have done this, but nothing as either borrowed from them, or as laid

laid out by himself is brought in: Many passages of the Fathers are misapplied; Many Cavils, Criminations and Calumnies are objected: Many strong words, as Logomachies, Vertigo's, —and Needle-headed Nicities, with Prophecies from Poets are used; a great part of *Erasmus Chiliæ* spent in Proverbs: Much paper blotted, but what concluded? I shall not here interpose my judgment, as Mr. *Menzeis* publishes his victory, as Trumpet in the Triumph himself, leaving to each one to read and judge of the papers; adding only of him, what was said of a Prolix and tedious Orator, who on little matter spent much time in many flourishes of words, and frequent Digressions. *Nullum vidi qui magis operose nihil diceret. Multa sed non multum. Magni passus sed extra viam.* Seneca. That is; I have seen none take greater pains to say nothing; he says many things, but not much; he walks at a great pace, but out of the way. For me as I mind not here, *actum agere*, so neither do I presume to add any thing to what Mr. *Dampster* has said in his way of Disputing, which I acknowledge both the shortest and best, to make Mr. *Menzeis* prove his Grounds; but he ever declining this, and urging we should shew in them any weakness or defect; this I here undertake for Mr. *Menzeis* further conviction, and happily some Protestants conversion, by the goodness and mercy of God. My design being to
 prove

prove positively the falshood and nullity, as well of his great Principle, of no Infallible visible Judg, as of both his Grounds, and that very succinctly, in a few Sections, without Digressing in the least, or meddling with what hath been said.

SECT. III.

Wherein Mr. Menzeis great Principle, That there is no Infallible visible Judge of Controversie in the true Church is Positively refuted, as the main Ground of all Divisions, Schisms, and Heresies, and contrary to the Scriptures, Fathers, and Reason.

AS all Rebellion in Kingdoms and Commonwealths, has its rise from contempt of the lawful Authority of Princes and Magistrates, upon the specious pretence of abuse of Power, against the Laws of the Kingdom, and Liberties of the Subjects: So all Heresies

in the Church begin with appeals from the Pastors of the Church, (the only Judges establish'd by Christ) to his Written Word, which is to all Christians as their Law Book. *LEX REX*, cry out Rebels with their *Calipha Buchanan*: *LEX JUDEX*, or *nolo verba qua non sunt scripta*, Answers the Heretick with an *Arian* in the Council of *Nice*. They will believe what they read, and not what they hear; though the Apostle teach us, that Faith comes of hearing, and the reason is, because with Mr. *Menzeis*, they acknowledge none speaking in matters of Faith and Religion Infallible.

No Infallible Visible Judge.

This is indeed that great Principle Protestants did broach to themselves in the beginning of Reformation, and at their very first leaping out from the Church, they would admit of no Infallible visible Judge, stand to no Sentence or Decree of Church, Councils, Fathers. Now this Principle being supposed by them to be solid, and an unquestionable truth, nothing can follow thereon, but what is true. *Ex vero nisi verum*, and consequently any private Protestant reading Scripture with a sincere intention, may, yea ought to adhere to what he thinks to be in Scripture, Should all the Protestant Church,

Church, with all her Assemblies, Synods, Preachers be of a contrary mind. Upon this, *Luther* and *Calvin* leave the Catholick Roman Church, and all visible Congregations in the Christian World at that time, because sayes *Chamiers Ep.* 49. (though *Mr. Menzeis* deny it was so) *Then Apostacy averted the whole body from Christ. They made all the Kings and people drunk, from the first to the last, says Calvin, Inst. l. 4. c. 18. and Whitaker, Cont. 4. q. 5. c. 3. No Religion but the Papistical had place in the Church. Duditims apud Bezam; Ep. 1. sayes more, if that be true which the Fathers have professed, with mutual consent, it is altogether on the Papists side.*

Upon this same Principle, innumerable other Sects and Sectaries, have left again Protestants, and the Protestant Church upon this, and this only Principle; every particular man reading Scripture, and taking it as he thinks both words and sense clear, is made his own Judge, and so as many heads almost, as many sentences, and diverse Opinions in Religion: some thinking Scripture clear for this, some for that Sect, some admitting or rejecting whole Books of Scripture at their pleasure: Yea some, and that too too many seeing most clear Scripture tossed and wrested by contrary Sects, suspend their Judgment, renounce their Faith, and quit all Religion, not knowing with what party to side. Others in fine, who think themselves deeper wits, as they

are more speculative and searching brains, having run through all can be said, to ascertain any point of Faith (save only the Divine Oracle in the Church) have turned Scepticks in Religion, grounding themselves on meer probability. Which Seed of Infidelity (sayes the Author of a Treatise, Intituled *Faith vindicated from possibility of Falshood*) Sown, when the Infalible Authority of the Church, as the rule of Faith, was renounced, dared, first appear publickly above ground, in the Writings of Mr. *Chillingworth*, and the L. *Falkland*, dressed up in a plausible Rhetorick, and set out under a yet more pleasant Title to Protestants, as being against Popery, was most graciously received by many. Yea when it appeared in Mr. *Tilletson* his Eloquent and Famous Sermon, did begin to get credit, as an Evangelical truth; and all this upon the foresaid great principle.

Upon it the holy work of Reformation by private men, opposing the Law and Gospel, to the judicial Sentence and Decrees of the whole Catholick Church: Upon it the glorious work of the Covenant by some factious Zelots against Prince and Pastors in the Protestant Church: Upon it Preachers and Pulpits clash at randome, Sects and Sectaries multiply, the Christian world is put in confusion with endless Jars and Debates in Religion: And all this because there is no Infalible Judge of Controversie, to give Sentence

in favour of any one party silencing all others. In a word for that (according to Protestants) God hath given us a Law without a Judge, however inconsistent this may seem, with Order, Providence and wisdom.

This one Principle, I say once more with the great St. Augustine, Serm. 14. de verbis Ap. Ruines the very Grounds of Religion. *In aliis questionibus non diligenter digestis non plenam Ecclesiam Authoritate firmatis, ferendus est disputator errans, ibi ferendus error: non tamen progredi debet ut fundamentum ipsum Ecclesiam quatere molia-* tur: According to the same St. Augustine, ib. whosoever run their heads, were they never so great, (with Mr. Menzeis) against this Inexpugnable wall of the Church Authority, are crushed. *Hoc habet Auctoritas matris Ecclesiae, hoc fundatus veritatis obtinet canon, contra hoc robur, contra hunc Inexpugnabilem murum quisquis arietat ipse confringitur.* Is it not on the Church her Infallible Authority, St. Augustine admits the Scriptures, contr. Ep. fund. c. 5. *Ego vero Evangelio non crederem nisi me Ecclesia commoveret Auctoritas;* Doth he not stick so close to the same Authority of the Church, that he says, Ep. fund. c. 4. *If any clear testimony were brought out of Scripture against it, he would neither believe Scripture nor Church, for that on the Church her Authority he believed the Scripture.* *Quod si forte in Evangelio aliquid apertissimum de Manichaei*

apostolatu invenire potueris , infirmabis mihi Catholicorum Authoritatem, qui jubent ut tibi non credam quâ infirmatâ jam nec Evangelio credere poterô, quia per eos illi credideram.

Was not the Church Judge in Religion for the first two thousand years, before any Scriptures were written? Was not again the Church of the *Jews* the same Judge after the Law was given, till Christ his time, and this by the express Order of God in Scripture, *Dent. 17.v. 8.* would God there direct them unto a Judge, and punish them with death, for not obeying in matters of the Law and Religion, an Authority which might any wise deceive them? Or in the Law of Grace it self, has Christ in *St. Matth. 18. v. 17.* commanded us to hear a Church not Infallible or subject to errour? Is not the Church of God built on a Rock, so that the gates of Hell shall not prevail against her, *S. Matth. 16. 19.* Has not the Church this promise from Christ, *S. Matth. 28. 20.* *And loe I am with you, even to the end of the world.* Is not the Church called by the Apostle *S. Paul*, *1 Tim. 3. 13.* *The Ground and Pillar of Truth?* However *Mr. Menzies* will have this ground sole Scripture. In fine, if these and such like Texts we should hear the Church, receive her Decisions, obey her commands, be not clear, what is clear in all the Scripture? or if they be subject to diverse Interpretations, who can better judge of their true sense, then the same Church?

Church? Will you say Natural Reason with the Socinians, or the private Spirit, with Anabaptists, and Quakers, or conferring of places and passages with Protestants? Is there any one more rational than the whole Church of God? any Spirit to be trusted, rather than the Spirit of Truth promised to her? or any one better versed in all the places of Scripture, than all the Bishops and Pastors of the Church composing her Supreme Judicatory in a general Council.

Let us hear I pray you the Fathers upon this I mean the Authority both of Church and Councils, as an Infallible Visible Judge, the better to silence Mr. Menzeis vain glorious bragging. S. Irenaus l. 1. c. 49. *We must believe those Priests that are in the Church, those that have a succession from the Apostles, who together with Episcopal Power, have according to the good pleasure of the Father, received the certain gift of truth.*

And again the same S. Irenaus c. 62. *the Church shall be under no mans judgement (he excepts not Mr. Menzeis, yea nor Luther, nor Calvin to reform her) for to the Church all things are known, in which is perfect Faith of the Father, and of the dispensation of Christ, and firm knowledge of the Holy Ghost, who teacheth all truth.*

Origen pref. in lib. periarch. *That only is to be believed for truth, which in nothing disagrees from the Tradition of the Church, and in understanding Scripture, we must not believe otherwise; then*

as the Church of God hath by succession delivered to us.

S. Cyprian de unit. eccl. That the Church cannot be adulterated with Heresy.

S. Chrysostom in c. 2. ~~js~~ That all the Hereticks in the World cannot pervert her Doctrine.

S. Cyril of Ferusalem, Catech. Myst. 18. That what she once hath received from Christ, she ever holds.

S. Cyril of Alexandria, l. 5. in Is. c. 54. That she is founded by Christ in truth for ~~her~~ ever.

S. Ambrose, l. 4. Hexam. c. 2. That she cannot fail.

Eusebius Casariensis de praparat Evang. l. 1. c. 3. That her Faith is invincible to the very Powers of Hell.

S. Augustine l. 4. de bapt. c. 4. I know by Divine Revelations, that the Spirit of Truth teacheth the Church all truth.

S. Augustine again, l. de Utilit. cred. c. 16. Fear not to run to the bosom of the Church, which by succession of Bishops descending from the Apostolical Sea, manifestly even to the acknowledgment of all mankind, hath obtained the height of Authority, Hereticks who on every side barked against her being partly by the consent of Nations, partly by the Authority of Councils, partly by the Majesty of Miracles condemned, to which Church not to yield primacy, is a point either of highest Impiery, or headlong Arrogancy.

In fine, the same S. Augustine Ep. 118. To think not right what the Catholick Church practises, is most insolent madness.

I leave to the Physicians judgment, what foot of this Distemper and Madness had the first Reformers of the Church, not only thinking and calling what she practised Idolatry and Superstition, but even judging and condemning her of Apostacy, Schism, and Heresy, as Mr. Menzeis here of Arrogancy and Pride; *Odi Ecclesia illius fastum*; I hate says he that Churches Pride, speaking of the Catholick Roman Church, for calling her self Infallible, but let me answer him as *Plato Diogen. Calcas Ecclesia fastum majore fastu*, he most presumptuously accuses her of Pride, no lawful establishd Judicatory, being proud in censuring private Delinquents as they deserve, but Rebels to their lawful Judges in censuring them, both Presumptuous and Proud with him.

But least any with Mr. Menzeis should apply all these Testimonies of the Fathers, to the diffusive body of the Church, and not to the Representative in a general Council, as if the one were Infallible in Believing, and not the other in Teaching, according to that promise of Christ, in *S. Matth. 28. 20. Go teach all Nations, and lo I am with you all days to the end of the world.* We must remark that when the necessary good, and preservation of the Church requires the per-

form-

formance of Christs words and promises in future ages, no less then in the Apostles time, then we are to take them, for all ages, except there be some expresse limitation made, as to Preach, Baptise, remit Sins, feed his Flock, lead men in all Truth, &c. Yet because each Apostle had a power over all the Church, this is said to every one of them, but to their Successors, who have not each one this power, together in a Council, which for this all the Fathers in all ages have acknowledged as a Sovereign and Infallible Judicatory, what ever Mr. *Menzies* standing to his Great Principle, say to the contrary.

Thus S. Cyril l. 10. de trin. averres Decrees of General Councils to be most Holy and Divine Oracles.

S. Leo Ep. 37. 64. A Sentence inspired by the Holy Ghost.

S. Epiphanius hæres. 77. A Decision not to be questioned.

S. Athanasius Ep. ad Episc. Afric. The Word of God which endureth for ever.

S. Basil Ep. 10. The Touch-stone to discern Hereticks.

Vincensius Lyrinensis in his Book against Heresies c. 4. says, all who will not be accounted Hereticks, must conform themselves to the Decrees of Oecumenical or General Councils.

S. Augustine Ep. 162. Calls them the last Sentence

tence can be expected in matters of Faith.

S. Gregory the great l. 1. Ep. 24. Reverences the first four General Councils as the four Evangelists.

And Constantine the great, the first Christian Emperour, Ep. ad eccle. Alex. as witness Sozomenus, l. 1. c. 24. and Socrates l. 1. c. 6. holds the Decrees of the Council of Nice, against Arius, a Divine Sentence flowing from the mouths of so many, and great Bishops inspired by the Holy Ghost.

Wherefore S. Augustine de bapt. contra doct. nat. l. 1. c. 7. concludes, That no doubt ought to be made, of what is by full Decree established in a Council. Neither is Mr. Menzeis Objection from him of any force, for when he speaks, l. 2. de bapt. c. 3. of mending Councils by Councils upon further experience, his words are, *Cum aliquo rerum experimento aperitur quod clausum est, & cognoscitur quod latebat*, clearly shewing he means not any Decision of Faith can be mended, which no experience can learn us, but Divine Revelation alone can teach.

Thus to shun prolixity in Citations, do not all the Fathers who were ever present at Councils, Subscribe their Canons and Decrees, annexing Anathemas and Excommunications against all who oppose them in the least.

I hear Mr. Menzeis Reply to all this first, but where is that Infallible Church the Scriptures and Fathers speak of? Answer, That is not here
the

the question, but that there is one, which is contradictory to his great Principle, *That there is no Infallible visible Judge.* Only I add the Protestant Church cannot be this, they speak of, she not being Infallible as themselves confess, and consequently cannot be the Church and House of God, which the Apostle calls the Ground and Pillar of Truth.

Secondly, How many Questions may be moved touching the lawfulness of Councils, now the Fathers speak not of the Council of *Trent*, but only of lawful ones? Answer, a contentious spirit will question any thing; but St. *Augustine* above cited, tells you of what is by full Decree establisht in a Council, no doubt or question ought to be made. Whatever Protestants object against the Council of *Trent*, did not the *Arians* against the *Nicene* Council? *Nolo verba qua non sunt Scripta*, that is, I will believe nothing but the written Word, ~~which~~ is but the echo repeating now, what was at first cryed out then.

Thirdly, God has obliged no man to hear Church or Council against his express and clear Word. Answer, This is true, but is not the Church the most faithful Depositary of Gods Word, best Judge of what is clear, and best Interpreter of what is Obscure? For no Scripture, says St. *Peter*, *Is of private Interpretation*; and doth not Christ in his written Word most
clearly

clearly and expressely command us to hear his Church, if we will not be holden as Publicans and Heathens.

Fourthly, No Council can be general, where all are not called, and sit with a decisive voice. Answer, Should even Hereticks be called to, and have in Councils their decisive voices? What agreement could this make in Points controverted? why not *Socinians*, *Anabaptists*, *Quakers*, as well as *Protestants*? Should *Presbyterians* sit with Bishops & Prelaticks in Protestant Assemblies? what a pitiful shift is this? If so, let the Covenant be renewed, Bishops again thrust out, and Mr. *Menzeis* set high, for yielding obedience to them, only through compulsion and fear of losing his place.

Fifthly, The Church her self when fallen in error, cannot be Judge, being Criminal and Impeached of most hainous crimes, she cannot be both Party and Judge. Answer, This Objection is all *Utopian* and *Chymical*, if we hear the Scripture and Fathers assuring us she cannot err: But giving, and not granting she did; who then her Judge? When Subjects rise against their Sovereign, Citizens against their Magistrates, Children against their Parents, leave they to be their Judges, because arraigned by them? Even Hereticks, must submit to the Sentence and Censures of the Church, when they fall at variance with her; though they turn Unnatural, she

she cannot become a Stepmother to them.

Sixthly, Infallibility in judging is proper to God. Answer, yes, none but God has it Essentially, and by Nature, but none I hope will deny, he may make the Pastors of his Church, as well Infallible in teaching points of Faith, as his Prophets and Evangelists, in penning the Scripture Books, or at least as any Protestant in reading and understanding them.

Seventhly, The Church of *Rome* is but a particular Church. Answer, we take it not so, when we say the Catholick Roman Church, but for all Churches in Communion with the Roman, as all Countries under the Roman Emperour, are called the Roman Empire, and all people under the Law of *Moses*, the Jewish Church, though that name taken strictly, belonged to the Tribe of *Juda*, because the chief City appertained to that Tribe, where the High Bishop resided. So the Universal Church is called the *Roman Catholick Church*, by reason of *St. Peter* and his Successors, her high Bishops residing there, whence *Rome* is the Centre of Ecclesiastical Communion, infusing unity in the whole dispersed body, as the Form of Universality or Catholickship. Wherefore *St. Cyprian* Ep. ad *Cornel.* calls her, *Ecclesiam principalem unde unitas Sacerdotalis exorta est*: That is, the Principal and chief Church, the Source and Centre of Unity amongst the Priests of all

all other Churches, and consequently the people.

Eighthly, But whereon Grounded this Infal-
 lible Authority of the Church ? Answer, On
 the clear places of Scripture and Fathers above
 cited ; It is the Ground and Pillar of truth, there-
 fore cannot err. It hath the promise of Gods
 Spirit to lead it into all truth, therefore cannot
 err. It is said to be built on the Rock, against
 which the gates of Hell shall not prevail, there-
 fore cannot err. Christ hath placed in it Apo-
 stles, Doctors, Pastors, and Bishops to the con-
 summation and perfection of the whole body,
 that we be not carried away with every blast of
 new Doctrines, therefore it cannot err. It is
 the House, the Spouse, the Mystick body of
 Christ, his Lot, Kingdom, and Inheritance in this
 world, therefore cannot err. On the Authori-
 ty of the Church the Fathers have received the
 Originals, Translations, and Sense of Scripture
 Books, yea some chief Points of Faith, not men-
 tioned in Scripture, as persons in the Trinity,
 Sacraments in the Church, keeping holy the
 Sunday, &c. therefore cannot err. Christ has
 commanded, and that under pain of Damnati-
 on, to hear the Church in matters of Faith and
 Religion, therefore it cannot err. All are
 obliged to live in Communion with the Church,
 therefore cannot erre. The Church hath
 from Christ, and ever has exercised a Ju-
 dicato-

dicatory Power, in all belonging to Faith and Worship, therefore cannot err. Christ hath sealed constantly in all Ages her Doctrine with Wonders, and Miracles, therefore it cannot err: To conclude, if the Church and her Pastors assembled in Councils mistake clear Scripture, misapply Scriptures, deceive, or be deceived, what particular man can either justly censure her, and them, or solidly Ground himself? *Magna vis veritatis*, great is the strength of Verity, and nothing more true then what is here holden out, that to admit with Mr. Menzeis, of no Infallible visible Judge of Controversie, is the only Fountain and Spring of all Divisions, Schisms, and Heresies, to which this one Protestant Principle, opens so wide a Gate.

SECT.

S
ple
Tr
exp
the
M.
rea
Aug
or
from

SECT. IV.

Wherein Mr. Menzeis first Ground of the Protestant Religion, to wit sole Scripture, is shewn to be no Ground to them; and that they have not reformed the Church according to the uncorrupted Scriptures, but corrupted the Scriptures to deform the Church.

Scripture then is Protestants ground of Religion, and in it all Fundamentals are clear, this is very plausible, to the ignorant people, who think it to be so upon their Ministers Tradition, and highly Glory both in reading and explaining the Bible. Yet no peculiar Ground to them, as was required of all Hereticks for ought M. Menzeis hath said, pretending with as great reason, the same. *Neither have Heresies, says St. Augustine, l. i. c. 4. contr. ad vers. leg. & proph. or certain Doctrines bewitching the mind sprung from any other Head, then from good Scriptures*

E

not

not well understood. But to proceed with order, before we come to the understanding of Scripture.

First, What Scripture, I pray you is this the Protestant Ground? Is it the Scripture Translated, or in the Original Tongues? Mr. Menzeis speaks nothing of this. The learned Chamiers cited as a chief Protestant Champion by him in his *Panstratia* l. 1. c. 2. f. 15. Says only true Originals, adding, as for Translations, the sense of Protestants is, that all of them, of what standing, name, or credit soever they be, and with what Diligence, Sincerity or Learning soever they were made, are only so far certain, as they agree with the first Context, I mean says he, as they express that, sense which is certainly manifest, to be the true sence of the Hebrew and Greek words. And Doctor Daniel in his Treatise, the Dippers Dipped, has these words, p. 1. No Translation is simply Authentical or the undoubted Word of God. To these Subscribes Doctor Baron our Countrey man, inferiour to no Protestant, I know, either in Loyalty or Learning, Tract. 1. c. 2. p. 46. Laici illiterati, &c. Unlearned Laicks, says he believe only implicitly, confusedly, and ~~upon~~ upon the Divine Authority of Scripture formally taken, by reason they can have no certain express and distinct knowledge of the Doctrine contained in Scripture as such, or of the agreement of Translations in vulgar Languages, with the Originals, yea, they know not so much, but

Virtually

up-

upon other mens testimony and report, as that the Doctrine propounded to them to be believed, is set down in the Scripture or written Word at all. Whence followeth according to these learned Protestants, the ground of the Protestant Religion must be only the Scripture in the Original Languages, that is Greek, Hebrew and Syriack, which of a thousand Protestants, 2. does not understand: Where then must all other Protestants ground their faith (a very few number of Linguists being excepted) that they believe only implicitly, and on other mens report, as D. Baron will have them? But this is the Colliers Faith Mr. Menzeis jeers, though I fear all his skill in Languages, often force him to turn a Collier himself: or shall they rely on Translations which Chamiers after all diligence used, and Doctor Daniel with him, confess not to be the undoubted Word of God, but in so far as they are known to agree with the Hebrew and Greek Texts, and how few undoubtedly know this? Yea Protestant Translations of the Bible are so generally corrupt, that you shall find none that has not been challenged, even by most learned Protestants, for manifold corruptions, and that very gross. To begin at Luther, let us hear Zuinglius of him, Tom. 2. ad Luther C. de Sacram. fol. 412. where after detection of many corruptions in Luther, he concludes thus, See how thy case standeth, that in the eyes of all men thou art seen to be a

manifest and common corrupter of holy Scripture, which thing thou canst never deny before any Creature, how much are we ashamed of thee, who hereto have esteemed thee beyond all measure, and now find thee to be such a false fellow. Neither can Luther deny his corruptions himself, for in that place of St. Paul, where a man is said to be justified by faith, he grants *l. Contra Cochleum p. 408.* he puts into the Text, the word, only, which the Apostle has not, *Licet Paulus verbo, sola non utatur que ego usus sum;* and is not this a main place Protestants use against us, so well are they grounded in Scripture. Of Calvin, Charles Molinæ in his Translation of the New Testament, part. 2. fo. 110. says Calvin in his Harmony, maketh the Text of the Scripture to leap up and down, as the truth it self declareth, he useth violence to the Letter of the Gospel, and in many places clearly transposes it, and besides this addeth to the Text. Are these the Reformers of the Church by the uncorrupted word, or corrupters of the Word to deform the Church? Castalio saith of Beza, That to note all his Errors in translating the New Testament, it would require a great volume. Five times he differs from himself, though one of the best Linguists ever Protestants had. King James a great Scholar, as a great Monarch in the sum of the conference before his Majesty, thinks the Geneva Translation the worst of all others. And Mr. Parkes in his defence of the first Testimony

con-

concerning Christs descending into Hell, says, as for the Geneva Bibles, it is to be wished that either they be purged from those manifold Errours, which are both in the Text, and at the Margent, or else utterly prohibited. Now as to our own Translations in English, Mr. Bruges in his Apology, Sect. 6. Says plainly, that the approved Protestants Translation, hath many omissions, many additions, which sometimes obscure, sometime pervert the sense. And M. Carleil p. 116. remarks that the English Protestants in many places detort the Scriptures from their right sense, and shew themselves to love darkness more then light, falsehood more then truth, they have corrupted and depraved the sense, obscured the Truth, deceived the Ignorant, and supplanted the simple. And Mr. Broughton a chief Linguist in England, in his Epistle to the Lords of the Privy Council, desireth them to procure speedily a new Translation, because that which is now is full of Errours. And in his Advertisement of corrections to the Protestant Bishops, saith, that their publick Translation of Scriptures is such, as it perverteth the Text of the Old Testament in four hundred forty eight places, and that it causeth millions of millions to reject the New Testament, and run to Eternal flames. How many divers and different Translations in Queen Elizabeths and King James times? how often what was first at the Margent, hath been put in the Text? Now if Translators of the

Scripture in English, men furnished with so many helps, endued with so many gifts, so well versed in the Hebrew, and Greek tongues, so guided by all the Rules Mr. Menzeis gives to attain the right meaning and sense of Holy Writ, have fallen into so many, and so gross errors and Mistakes, as to have depraved, detorted, wrested, obscured the Scripture and Word of God, so that it, as Translated by them deceiveth the Ignorant, supplanteth the simple, perverteth the Text in so many places, as that it carrieth millions to Eternal Flames; What hope can any one have of meaner Talents with fewer helps, and less learning and knowledge, to attain by his own private reading of Scripture, the undoubted Truth, Steadiness in faith and Religion, a full and satisfactory solution of all doubts, or security of Salvation? and yet these very same so corrupt Translations (as their own Chospellers testify) are read in Churches, expounded in Pulpits, and put in the hand of every one who understands neither Latine, Greek nor Hebrew, as his sole ground of Faith, and Judge of controversie, whereby he is made able to Judge, not only of Popish Errors, the Writings of the Fathers, and Decrees of Councils, but even of his own Pastors Doctrine, his Churches Faith, and his Countries Religion.

Secondly, to come to the Originals; Shall they then onely be the Protestants Ground of Faith? If so, I ask Mr. Menzeis where we shall find

find them? Yea we are so far from having all the Originals, that it is doubted in what Language some parts of Scripture were written. The purity of Originals is sometimes called in Question, and Calvin Inst. 1. 1. C. 13. *Doth imagine even these the Fountains run not always clear.* Luther Enar. in Is. Cryes out on the Jews for crucifying the Text, as well as Christ, and upon Gen. C. 24. Says again, he has often told many words there be in the Hebrew Text, which the Hebrews themselves do not understand. And to say true, amongst the Jews, the least of their three Massoreshe's (so they call the Book which contains the many corruptions, and divers Lectons in the Hebrew Text) counts eight hundred places disagreeing, ambiguous or corrupt, neither do the most learned Rabbies agree in the Letter of Scripture; In Hebrew it self, some reading according to the Points, or Vowels put in by Rabbi Jacob, and some by these of Rabbi Aron, most different one from another; all the points being added to the Text, Five hundred years after Christ, and that by his professed Enemies the Jews, long after the Vulgar Latine Translation which was made before the Text, and Letter of Scripture was corrupt. But Protestants take in also with these the corruptions of the Greek Text remarked in part by St. Irenæus, Tertullian, Origen, and others, says Eusebius, when the ancient Hereticks the Arians, Macedonians,

Nestorians, &c. had corrupted and adulterated the Word of God, to support their Errours, as Protestants at present in all their Translations do. I know M. *Menzeis* will tell me perhaps he hath seen both the Hebrew and the Greek Texts, well but who assures him they are not corrupt? Yes, but the Protestants have corrected them, and that according to the Authenticks, which never any Protestant did see. The most Learned amongst Protestants have never seen the Original Scriptures which were first penned by the Prophets, Apostles, and Evangelists; Copies are no less subject to faults in the Letter, then Translations to mistakes in the sense. Yea, the Authors of that great & famous Bible that is Printing at *London* (if not yet ended) in so many Languages, witnesseth in the Preface they have set out, not so much as one Copy could be found they can assure to agree in all things with the Original: their labour may be great in this vast Volume to correct the Copies they find deficient, but their Authority is not Infallible: In a word, no Infallible Authority is admitted by Protestants to judge either of the Letter or Sense, *For that savours rankly*, says M. *Menzeis* of that *Erroneous Popish Tenet, of an Infallible visible Judge of Controversie*. And I Answer, to deny one in all these and such like cases savours rankly of a tottering, wavering, groundless Faith, most like to that of M. *Menzeis*.

I say yet further, if no Translations of Scripture can be a ground of Faith, as most learned Protestants grant, so neither any Original it would seem, without some Infallible Judge; for I must ever be sure they are uncorrupted; and again all the defect in Translations coming from the misunderstanding of Originals; I ask who dare say he understands them, better then they who have Translated, and upon this, as he himself reads, and conceives, ground his Religion and Faith.

Thirdly, before all this, if *M. Menzeis* will prove it a solid Ground to rely on sole Scripture, as the onely ground of Faith, without any Infallible visible Judge, or assurance, that he who tells me this is the uncorrupted Letter, this the true and genuine Sense, has the peculiar assistance of the Holy Ghost: I demand what Infallible Motive can prudently perswade Protestants that the Word of God they rely on, was ever set down in Writing, or is extant at this day? Is it the testimony of Scripture calling it self Gods Word, or the Innate Light of the same Scripture, showing it self to be such, to a well disposed Intellect and mind? If the first, do not *Nicodemus* and *S. Thomas* Gospels carry the same titles, with these of *St. Matthew* and *St. Mark*? If the second, then the Fathers of the first three ages (whom *M. Menzeis* most owns) were not well disposed persons, who did not acknowledge some
Books

Books of Scripture till the Authority of a Council at *Carthage* had declared them Canonical ; and much less *Luther*, that holy man, who rejecteth *St. James* Epistle with some others.

As Protestants ground their Faith, say they, on Gods word, so *Quakers* on the Spirit : and we deny not but both be equally Infallible , if once known Infallibly to be the Spirit or Word of God . But we demand of each Sect, what Infal-
 lible External Rule or Motive they give us, to know either Gods Word speaking in Scripture, or Spirit in them ? Both answer with *M. Menzeis*, they both show themselves to all who are well disposed. But this clears not us, the well disposed heart being only known to God ; let all then be objectively true, (as *M. Menzeis* sayes his Religion is) which they both teach, (as certainly is, what ever by Gods Word or Spirit is revealed) we only insist to know Infallibly that God did reveal such Doctrine as theirs, either by his Word or Spirit. For we receive now no Immediate Revelations, as the Prophets and Apostles did in old times, nor have we *Evidenti-
 am in attestante*, as the Divines call it, that is any Evidence that it is God who speaks ; points of faith being only propounded to us by men, who either put the Scriptures in our hands to read , or teach us by word of mouth. The Protestants great Principle, let's own no man or Church as an Infallible Judge ; yea *M. Menzeis* in his sixth
 paper

paper, offers upon this to turn Papist, if the Infallible assistance of the Propounder can be proved necessary: but never clears what other way we can be Infallibly assured that all which the Protestants do teach, was revealed by God. Unless it be in his third paper, where speaking of the True and Genuine Sense of Scripture, he tells us we may have it as from a Jurist, the Explication of a Municipal Law, or from a Mathematician, a demonstration of Euclides. But what a weak Answer is this? Do any receive Demonstrations on Authority as Points of Faith? Or is the assent I give to the Law so explained by a Jurist Infallible? If Christ himself had not shown his Divinity by his Works and Wonders, he grants the Jews had committed no sin in refusing to believe him: The Apostles Credentials were their Miracles, both did this evidence [the Infallible assistance they had of Gods Spirit to the World; and shall any man trust M. Menzeis boldly asserting there is no necessity of any? was it not for this the power of Miracles was left in the Church, as the marks of her assistance, and seals of her Doctrine, with other Motives of credibility? Notwithstanding Protestants with M. Menzeis will propound to us the Catalogue of Canonical Scripture Books, assure us of the uncorrupt Copies and Letter, enforce upon our Consciences the sense they give, whilst so confidently obtruding all this, they neither dare,

or

or do say, nor can evidence by any external mark or sign, they have the particular assistance of Gods Spirit; As if all this were clear in it self, with Mathematical Demonstrations. But doth Scripture in our Bibles, show it self better to be the Word of God now, then when Christ was speaking in person? Then an external Evidence, *God did speak by his Son*, is acknowledged as necessary by him, and now shall any man reasonably say, there is no necessity of any, when he speaks by his servants and Church? however this prove efficacious and strong for M. Menzeis conversion, it would seem to me more then sufficient for his, or any mans conviction.

Fourthly, to claim to Scripture, yet so as they can no wise evidence they take it aright, is common to Protestants with all Hereticks, so no peculiar Ground. When Sectaries clash with Sectaries, is not all their babling out of Scripture? You shall see, says *Vincentius Lyrinensis*, c. 35. *Hereticks so abound with Scripture, as they fly through all the Volumes of the holy Law, through Moses, the Books of Kings, the Psalmes and Prophets, &c. read the works of Paulus Samosatenus, Priscillian, Eunomius, &c. you shall not find a page which is not Coloured and painted out with the sentences of Old and New Testament. Nestorius to support his Heresie gloried (as Gennadius reporteth in his Catalogue) in the evidence of three score Testimonies which he produced, as the*

the Covenant in three hundred, whereof scarce three any wise to the purpose. The *Valentinians*, *Marcionists*, *Arians*, will submit to none but Scripture, as St. *Augustine* witnesseth of *Maximus* the *Arian* Bishop in his first Bok against him. Neither doth it avail M. *Menzies* to say *Scriptures* are clear in terminis, or made clear by conferring of places, or show themselves clearly to a well disposed mind.

First, for that though a place of Scripture be clear in it self, yet when divers Sects take it diversly, a man may justly suspect his own judgment, seeing so many of a contrary mind. So that it wanteth not difficulty to determine always what is absolutely clear, there being many clear places as would seem, not to be taken in the clear and obvious sense, as the passages *Hereticks* did most build on, will presently shew. As when *Marcion* despiseth *Moses* and the Prophets upon Christs own clear words in *S. John* the 10. *How many soever have come before me are Thieves and Robbers.* The *Manichees* affirmed Christ to be the Sun, upon a like Scripture in *St. John* the 8. *I am the light of the world.* The *Waldenses* taught no man could be put to death, no not by the lawful Authority of a Judge, upon clear Scripture again, *Exod. 20. Thou shalt not kill,* &c. The Devil citeth clear Scripture to Christ, and the Jews against his death, *we have heard in the Law the Messiah abideth for ever.*

More;

Moreover many seeming Contradictions in Scripture, you shall find in *Becan* and others, one might think clear. And many things are believed even by Protestants, which be not in Scripture at all: as Persons in the Trinity, Sacraments in the Church, and the Command of keeping holy the Sunday; the Scripture neither naming persons, or telling what a person is, defining Sacraments (as *M. Menzeis* doth) or setting down their number; abrogating the keeping of the Sabbath, or having for the Sunday any command. Many places of Scripture again are flatly against Protestants, and clear for us, as for the Real Presence, *This is my Body, this is my Blood*, S. Matth. 26. For Justification not by Faith only, but also good works. Ye see then how that by works a man is justified, and not by Faith only, S. James 2. 24. For Traditions from the Apostles, besides the written Word. Therefore brethren stand fast and hold the Traditions which ye have been taught, whether by Word, or our Epistle, 2 Thes. 2. 13. And such like places cited in most Books of Controversie, for all Controverted Tenets, Protestants never being able to bring any one clear place of Scripture against any of our Tenets, not evidently mistaken or confessedly corrupted, as when they make S. Paul say, a man is justified by faith only, *Luther* above cited, granting he has put in the word only, which Saint Paul hath not; or, *Thou shalt not make to thy self*
any

any Graven Image, in place of Idol, as is clearly the word *Pesel* in the Hebrew Text.

Secondly, as to conferring of places, and explaining the more obscure, by these which are clear, did not *Arius* boast of this against the Fathers of the Council of *Nice*, proving the unity in Nature of the Father and Son, out of these words in *S. John* the 10. *I and my Father are one.* No, says the *Arian*, this place as obscure to us, and passing the reach of Humane capacity, must be explained by this other more clear in *St. John* 17. where Christ prays his Apostles, *May be one with him, as he and his Father are one;* that is in will and affection, and surely the second place is clearer to us, and consequently according to *M. Menzeis* Rule, the *Arian* Heresie must prevail; neither will he ever be able standing to his Rule, to answer an *Arian* Cöbler making this Objection, as Learned Writers remark. *Eutyches* conferring these two places, *The Word was made flesh, in S. John* 1. and *the water was made Wine, in S. John* 2. fell in this detestable Blasphemy, That the Humane Nature was changed into the Divine, as the Water was converted into Wine. And without all doubt again, the second is the clearer place to us, the first, that two Natures should be united in one Person, surpassing as the Divines teach, even the Natural capacity of Angels. *Manicheus* explains the same passage, *The Word was made flesh, Figma;*

guratively, and in show, as Protestants; *This is my body*, and that by a clear place of *S. Paul* to the *Phil. 2. v. 7.* where it is said, *Christ took upon him the form of a servant, and was made in the likeness of men.* Most clear words as would seem in favour of this Heresie, and such that if Protestants could bring any, with as great a show against the real presence, all their Pulpits should sound with them till their hearers became deaf. But there be none in all the Scripture so clear against the real presence I say, as the words quoted have a seeming clearness against the real Incarnation of Christ, the four Evangelists, and *S. Paul* speaking in so expresse and formal words for the former, that the Fathers with *St. Chrysostome*, *Hom. 6.* have recourse to the words for the real presence as clearer, to prove, that giving in the Sacrament his body and blood, he must have taken the Nature of Man. *Nestorius* on the contrary will have these words of *S. John the 2.* *Dissolve ye this Temple, and in three dayes I shall raise it again,* to be taken Litterally, and not Figuratively; and upon this holds out a new Heresie, that the Son of God did dwell only in his Holy Humanity as in a Temple. *Valentine* and *Apollinaris* reading in *S. John 3.* *no man hath ascended into heaven, but he that descended from Heaven,* gain sayes the Mystery of Christs Incarnation, and wil needs have his flesh to have descended from Heaven, as his Manhood afterwards ascend-
 ed

ed thither. And this Heretical Exposition, they confirm by converting the ensuing places in *St Paul to the Ephesians 4. He that descended, the same is also he who ascended.* And in the first to the *Corinthians 15. The first man of Earth Earthly, the second Man of Heaven Heavenly.* A thousand such Errors in the greatest Fundamentals of Christianity have Hereticks drawn out of the clear Fountains and Brooks of holy Writ, by the deceivable, and deceiving search of weighing places; Why not Protestants with them? they sail on the same Sea, and deep of Scriptures with them; they direct their course by the same Card of conferring clearer and obscurer places: the same Rule they apply to all the crooked lines of their Errors and Deviations. What can be answered to all this: *M. Menzeis* Principle always standing, *No Infallible visible Judge*, but to have recourse with him to the well disposed mind, wherefore

Thirdly, I say this doth not yet satisfy to the Question, no not with all the means of Interpretation *M. Menzeis* doth bring, it being as hidden, Intricate, Doubtful and Inscrutable, who performs all these Conditions aright, as to find out certainly and infallibly the true sense of Scripture, without an Infallible Judge. Yea supposing one uses them aright, yet let us learn from no lesser Protestant then Doctor *Jeremy Taylor*, what certainty of the true sense men can attain by

them: His words are so remarkable to my purpose in a Discourse of liberty in Prophesying, Sect. 4. that here I even set them down at length. First then says he, Sometime the sense is drawn forth by the Context, and Connexion of Parts. It is well when it can be so. But when there is two or three Antecedents and Subjects spoken of: What Man, or what Rule shall ascertain me, that I make my Reference true, by drawing the Relation to such an Antecedent, to which I have a mind to apply it, another hath not. Secondly, One other great pretence is, the conference of places, which is of so indefinite capacity, that if there be ambiguity of words, variety of sense, alteration of Circumstances, or difference of Style amongst Divine Writers, then there is nothing which may be more abused by wilful people, or may more easily deceive the unwary, or that may more amuse the most diligent observer. Thirdly, Oftentimes Scriptures are pretended to be expounded by a proportion and Analogy of reason, but it is with Reason as with mens tastes. When a man speaks reason, it is but reason he should be heard, &c, yet because it must be reason that must judge of reason, unless other mens understandings were of the same Air, the same Constitution and ability, they cannot be prescribed unto by another mans reason; especially because such reasonings as usually are in Explication of particular places of Scripture depend upon minute Circumstances and Particularities, in which it is so easy to be deceived, and so

hard

hard to speak Reason regularly and always, that it is the greater wonder, if we be not deceived. Fourthly, Others pretend to Expound Scripture by Analogy of Faith. This he says is but a Chimeræ, a thing in the Clouds, which varies like the right and left hand of a Pillar, &c. Fifthly, Consulting of Originals, is thought a great matter to Interpretation of Scriptures; but this is to small purpose, for indeed it will expound the Hebrew and the Greek, and rectifie Translations. But I know no man that says, that the Scriptures in Hebrew and Greek are easy, & certain to be understood, and that they are hard in Latine and English. The difficulty is in the thing, however it be expressed, the least in the Language, &c. Then numbr. 6. by faith in general. All these ways of Interpreting Scriptures, which of themselves are good helps, are made either by design, or by our infirmities. Ways of Intricating and Involving Scriptures in greater difficulty, because men do not learn their Doctrines from Scripture, but come to the understanding of Scriptures with preconceptions and Ideas of Doctrines of their own, and then no wonder Scripture look like Pictures, where in every man in the room thinks they look on him only, and that wheresoever he stands, or how often soever he changes his Station. So that now what was intended for a remedy, becomes the Promoter of our Disease, and our Meat becomes the matter of sickness; and the mischief is, the wit of man cannot find a remedy for it. For there is no Rule, no Li-

with no certain Principle by which all men may be guided to a certain, and so infallible interpretation; that he can make any Equity prescribe to others to believe his Interpretations in places of Controversy, or ambiguity; and that it is not his duty to do so.

Quando in his confutations of the Book which Melancthon wrote against him, observes there are twenty several Opinions concerning Justification all drawn from the Scriptures; by the men only of the Augustan confession. There are sixteen several Opinions concerning Original sin; and as many Definitions of the Sacraments; there are six of men that disagree about them. Lastly, He concludes that in those ordinary means of Expounding Scripture as searching the Originals, Conference of Places, Paraphrase, Reason, and Anatomy of Faith, are all dubious, uncertain, and very fallible. He that is the wisest, and by consequence the best Judge in Expounding Scripture in all probability of Reason, will be very far from confidence, because every one of these, and many more, are like so many degrees of Improbability, and uncertainty, all depriving our certainty of finding out truth in such Mysteries; and amidst so many Difficulties.

Remark well all this discourse from so great a Protestant Doctor, finding no certainty of the true sense of Scripture, by all the means of Interpretation, and reflect with all a little in how hard a condition Protestants stand, admitting no Infallible visible Judge in Controversy, but bold

ly undertaking to decide all that which is contro-
 verted by Sole Scripture, Explained by such fal-
 lible means, and yet more fallible manner is but a
 Labyrinth of windings and turnings to pass from
 Scripture as clear in words, to confuting of plac-
 ces, and deducing consequences, after Prayer u-
 sed, and diligent search made, with a well dis-
 posed mind, then to the inward impression of the
 private Spirit, against which the Prophets and
 Apostles do generally exclaim, *Ezechiel* *chap. 3.*
Chapter 3. I will be to the foolish Prophets, who follow
their own Spirit. *2. Peter in his 2. Epistle Chapter.*
Ne Prophecy of Scripture be of Private Interpretation.
 Neither is the question here, what is In-
 wardly required in every private man to believe
 Scripture, but what is the external, visible, and
 infallible Rule of Faith, for that is out of all
 doubt with us, Faith, Faith, supernatural and in-
 fused virtue, to which the pious motions in the
 will is no less requisite, then the Supernatural
 light in the understanding to assent to what is re-
 vealed by God. But seeing neither this light nor
 pious motions as they are supernatural, and in-
 eline only to believe a revealed truth, do mani-
 fest themselves to be such. Therefore many
 thousands of well disposed persons, and who
 seek God in the sincerity of their hearts, occa-
 sionally persuade themselves, till they be better
 instructed, they believe such a thing as a revea-
 led truth by God, which is a condemned Error

by him. And this note can deny, who will not maliciously condemn a world of zealous Ignorants; yea some even most learned and holy Fathers; who with *St. Cyprian* in the Point of Re-baptism; have believed an Error for a revealed Truth; before it was clearly decided by the Church. *Non enim debemus in agnitione huiusmodi*

However, whether it be this, or something else. *M. Menzies* calls a well disposed mind; others the Spirit, or the private Spirit; the Spirit of the Righteous man; and so forth; I say it cannot be either with the holy Scripture, or alone, the Rule of Faith, and Judge of Controversies. Because none without some Particular help can be infallibly assured of this Interior Motion, Affection, or Spirit, whether it be Natural, or Supernatural, from God or the Devil; the Spirit of Darknes or Light, know no man, as *M. Field* confesseth. *La. q. C. q. d. Proverth any thing is, or may be doubted of, by that which is as much to be doubted of as it self.* We are counselled in the *Epistle of St. John Chrys.* Not to believe every Spirit, but to try the Spirits if they be of God: But if the Spirits must be brought to the Touchstone of Trial; if they must be judged and approved by some other well known and undoubted Authority; they are not the sole Rule and Supreme Judge of Faith and Controversy. Because this Spirit is secret and hidden, our Faith publick and evidently credible; this Spirit particular, our Faith

Faith Catholick or Universal; this Spirit the
 gift of every particular man, our Faith subject
 to no private censure. Wherefore M. Hooker
 Eccl. Pol. L. 1. Sect. 14. and Whitaker against
 Stapleton C. 3. C. 4. Ingeniously grant, that
 the outward Letter of Scripture, sealed with
 the inward and private Spirit, is not a sufficient
 Warrant for every particular man to receive
 or reject Scripture Books; but that the pub-
 lick Authority of Gods Church, is necessarily
 required. Whence I say further with S. Au-
 gustine 1. Contr. Ep. fund. c. 5. *That Authority
 which we obey and believe, testifying the Books of
 the holy Gospel, the same must we believe, witness-
 ing this to be the sense of the Gospel, that is not
 the private Spirit.* But the same Authority of
 the Church. Thirdly, This private Spirit is so
 far from being the Judge of controversy upon
 any pretence of adhering to Scripture, either as
 clear in it self, or explained by it, that instead
 of compounding debates and keeping unity (the
 chief Office of this Judge) it is the very Root of
 Dissention, and Fountain of Heresies and
 Schisms, for as by experience we see it to be dif-
 ferent in divers persons, so as the Bell to fools,
 it speaketh as they fancy, it inclines as they are
 affected, it points out the Object according to
 the Colour which is in the eye, it is like a false
 light which makes the Aspect of best and fairest
 Figures vary; It is often a blind zeal, or a pre-
 judi-

iudicate Opinion, which hinders to see what is
 clear in Scripture, as *S. Augustine* l. 3. de Doctr.
 C. 10. well Remarks, If the Prejudice, saith he,
 of any Erroneous Opinion preoccupate the mind,
 whatsoever the Scripture bath to the contrary, men
 take it to be a Figurative Speech. So that it fur-
 nisheth to every Sectary reading Scripture, his
 own Spectacles, in conferring places, his own
 Rule of proportions: His private Weights to
 ponder Reasons, his particular Forge to coin
 Opinions, his secret Touch-stone to try Do-
 ctrines, his own Reed to measure the Temple,
 Sanctuary and Altar: Makes him his own high
 Priest, Pastor, and Judge, setting up within him-
 self a Supreme Judicatory, giving ever sentence
 in his favour, and censuring all the world beside;
 So that none standing to this Rule, can be com-
 pelled to the unity of the Church, and yet none
 can be accounted Hereticks, as the learned
Shares l. 1. de desi. fid. C. 11. most judiciously
 remarketh, if we take Scripture as men read,
 who think themselves well disposed, or Expound-
 ed by it self according to the Dictamen of the
 private Spirit, for ground, for who can swarve
 from Scripture as clear, according to his parti-
 cular Judgment and Spirit, which he even esteem-
 eth to be the Spirit of God.

Scripture therefore cannot be Judge of Con-
 troversie, as *M. Menzies* will have it. 1. By rea-
 son the sentence of this Judge must breed a cer-
 tain

tain and Infallible assurance of all that can come in doubt, which Scripture cannot do. It being infallible indeed in it self, but not to us, who may doubt if such a Book be Canonical, such a Copy conform to the Original, such a Translation Authentick, such a place clear, such a sense genuine.

3. The Judge of Controversie ought to give a clear sentence, which the learned and unlearned may equally understand, and as the Law, sayes the Apostle, *is not for the just, but the unjust*, so the Judge of Controversie is not only for the well disposed, but more in some manner for others, and especially the unlearned and unstable, who according to St. Peter, *Wreck the Scriptures to their own damnation*; Yea the most learned amongst the Fathers, as S. Basil, and S. Gregory Nazianzen, after much pains in the study of Scripture, as testifieth *Ruffinus* l. 11. Hist. C. 9. refuse to interpret them, but according to the Rule and Uniform consent of their Fore-fathers, not relying on all the means of Interpretation M. Menzeus prescribes; and they had reason, the Scripture being the Book S. John describeth to be clasped with seven Seals, Apoc. 5. v. 16. which Ezekiel termeth the enrolled volume, written within and without. S. Ambrose Ep. 44. *A Sea containing most profound Senses of Prophetical Riddles*. S. Augustine l. 2. de doctrina, Christ. C. 6. *hard in the Style, Discourse, Places, as well as in the Substance*. The Republick of Letters even to this day is

ject and Matter: which makes him cry out, *L. 12. Confess. c. 14. O the wonderful depth of thy Speeches, O the wonderful depth;* S. Hierome Ep. 13. C. 4. Says, the Text of Scripture has a Shell to be broken, before that we can tast the sweetness of the Kernel: and Vincentius Lirinensis, C. 2. That all take not holy Scripture by reason of its deepness in one and the same sense, but some interpret one way, some another, so that there may seem to be picked out as many senses as men; for Novatus doth Expound one way, and Sabellius another, otherwise Donatus, otherwise Arius Eunomius, Macedonius, otherwise Photinus, Apollinaris, and other Hereticks with them: therefore very necessary it is for the manifold turnings and by-ways of Errors, that the Line of Prophetical and Apostolical interpretation be levelled according to the Square of the Ecclesiastical and Catholick sense, whereof Tertullian de Praescript. gives this reason, for that the sense adulterated, is alike perillous as the Stile corrupted. But what danger of this, says M. Menzeis if Scripture be clear, men cannot mistake (if not wilfully blinded) what is so? Could not the Law-maker speak as clear as the Judge? Answer, we have seen there is nothing almost in Scripture, but has been, and so may be mistaken: Therefore the necessity of a Judge, however the Law speak clear, has been acknowledged by the greatest men, and best wits in the world, Aristotle in the first Book of his Morals, and fourth of his Politicks, And Plato in his Republick, prefers good Judges even to best Laws:

Laws: Judges have been ever establish'd by the Laws in all Nations, as by Scripture, in the Church of God; and the necessity of one to keep concord and unity, is partly grounded on the nature of most clear Words and Sentences, which may be taken according to the Letter or Sense, Properly or Figuratively, Morally, or Mystically, and so forth: Partly on the diversity of Opinions, men commonly judging as they are affected, and diversity of one and the same thing as their understandings, inclinations, or interests leads them. His Majesties Secretary of State may write no doubt, as clear as the Lords of Council and Session speak, yet his Letters are directed to them in most businesses of weight, least others should take them otherwise then written, or wrest them to their own ends; even so is it of Scripture written by the Prophets, and Evangelists, and deliver'd to the Pastors and Doctors of the Church.

Whence Catholick Romans build their Belief upon Scripture, nor taken as they fancy, but Explained by Apostolical Tradition conserv'd in the Church, and the unanimous consent of the Fathers, and if any doubt arise of both these, on the General Definition and Decision of the present Catholick Church.

Protestants, as M. Menzeis holds out, ground their Faith on Scripture, which they have corrected, or rather corrupted, as clear in it self, or
made

made clear by diligent reading and conferring of places with prayers, and (as they imagine) in well disposed mind, that is a Prejudicate Opinion that their own Tenets are right.

Now let any man judge, which of these two is most conform to Scripture it self, in both Testaments, to the practice of the Church in all ages, to the consent of Fathers above cited, and Reason. For first, This the Protestant way would seem vain, arrogant and presumptuous, in so far as that a man who followeth it, must be so confident of himself, that if he fancy Scripture to be clear for such a Tenet, were all the Christian World in a contrary judgment, yea had all Christians been so from the time of the Apostles, yet must he stand to his fancy grounded upon clear Scripture, as he thinks. So that no persuasion can remove him from it, for that it is a point of his Faith, but for a man to be so peremptorily resolute in the sense he hath found in Scripture by his private reading, is very presumptuous, I say, for wherein can he ground prudently such a strong assent, as is required in Divine Faith, which ought to be above all can be said against it. Shall it be on the clearness of the words? conference of places? on his skill in Tongues? on his weighing the precedent and consequent places? or on the assistance of the Spirit given to him? If so, is it not intollerable pride and presumption in any one man, to think that

that no other was ever so clear sighted, or quick
 witted, to see and understand in Scripture what is
 clear? no other in such a multitude of Doctors
 and Fathers, so well versed in the Original Lan-
 guages, so circumspect to confer places, so
 exact to weigh Circumstances, so acute to
 draw Consequences, in fine, so well disposed
 to find the Truth, so fervent in Prayer, so par-
 ticularly enlightened, directed, and assisted by
 the Spirit of God? What is Whimsical, Pha-
 natick, and Foolish, if this be not? wherefore
 Doctor Field ashamed any should think this to
 be Protestant Doctrine, says, *None of them* Dr
withers teach the Scriptures to be so clear, that they may
 be certainly understood by reading and conferring
 of places. For the Rule of Faith says he, in his Ap-
 pendix 2. p. p. 12. *a* Doctrine descending by Tra-
 dition from the Apostles, according to which the
 Scriptures are to be Expounded. And in his fourth
 Book C. 14. The Rule of Faith is the consenting
 judgment of them that went before us, the Rule with-
 out which we cannot know the meaning of the things
 that are in Scriptures, for who shall be able to un-
 derstand them, but he that is settled in these things
 which the Apostles presupposed in their delivery of
 Scripture. Afterward in the 15. Chap. having
 said, There is no question but there be many obscu-
 rities in Scripture. And in the 18. Ch. having
 set down many senses of Scriptures, in the 19.
 he writes thus, We confess that neither conference

of

of places, nor consideration of what followeth, or goes before, nor looking into Originals, are of any force, unless we find the things which we receive to be understood and meant in the places interpreted to be consonant to the Rule of Faith, (that is, Tradition conserved in the Church), neither is there any of our Divines that ever taught otherwise. Where you see by Doctor Field, M. Menzeis is discarded from being a Protestant Divine; the Scripture however clear, is declared to be no Rule or Ground of Faith, but according to the sense of them that went before us; as all other means besides Tradition in his 16. Ch. are propounded to be but probable Conjectures, and not infallible grounds. And this most rationally, for what private man, as I have said, can assure himself, that either the finding out the true sense of Scripture, as to him, is tyed to the means of Interpretation M. Menzeis sets down, or that he makes a right use of all these means? For as the same Dr. Field judiciously remarks, and ingenuously grants with S. Augustine, contra. Ep. Fundam. and de Util. cred. few men have leasure, fewer strength of understanding to examine the particular Controversies, so many, and so intricate in these our dayes: and that the way to satisfy their Consciences in this most important affair, is to find out the true Church, and rest in her judgment *Ad sapientiam, says S. Augustine, in Ecclesia Spirituales pauci perveniunt*;

veniant; ceteram vero turbam non intelligendi vivacitas, sed credendi simplicitas rarissimam facit; that is, few, even Spiritual ones in the Church attain to perfect knowledge, the rest being made most sure, not by their quickness in understanding, but by their simplicity in believing.

2. This the Protestants way is but a trifling loosing of time, never having been found able to settle debates amongst themselves, as witness 60. Synods holden in 60. years time, says *Rescript. l. de Atheismo*, in which all taking Scripture for their ground, without any Infallible Judge, did so little agree, that they parted not so much as good friends. *Neque dantes dexteras fraternitatis aut humanitatis.* How many Examples of this amongst Lutherans, and Calvinists, Prelaticks, and Presbyterians, and even in our confessions of Faith, and Covenant among our selves? I know M. Menzeis Answer will be, their Dissentions are not in Fundamentals, (of these I shall speak presently in the next Section) only here I ask, why then so great cruelty, so much blood, so many Excommunications and Curses? If they did not think them so, who moved such troubles, they were either most cruel, or mad, as Tertul-lian, l. de præs. most truly says, in *Disputing out of Texts of Scripture* (that is as every man reads and understands) *there is no other good got but either to make a man sick or mad.* It is not so in the Catholick Church, what ever M. Men-

zeis lays of Jesuits and Dominicans, neither party having ever contested in any thing, that was once decided by the Church.

3. The Protestants way is Preposterous, Religion being Established before the Scriptures, and they only written to true believers, whence *Tertullian* prescribing against all Hereticks, says, *We do not admit them to dispute from Scripture, till first they can show who their Ancestors were; from whom, by whom, when and to whom, the form of Christian Religion was delivered.* Whereupon to conclude all this, I ask at M. *Menzeis*, is every particular man amongst Protestants infallibly assured by Scripture of what he believes? If so, why not then Catholicks, and all the Catholick Church? they receive the Scriptures with Protestants, yea Protestants only from them: their Churchmen read the Scriptures with as great diligence, they be in a far greater number, they have ten for one who have Expounded it; they apply no less all the means for a right Interpretation, they study the Originals, confer Places, pray many hours both day and night, have no Wives, Children, or Family to divert them, most of them have renounced all pretence to Riches, Honours, and all Temporal Interests, wherewith they might be Byassed any wise in what they profess: The extraordinary and unparallelled pains they take in the most Barren,

Savage, and cruel nations of the Earth, for their conversion to Christianity would seem sufficient to evidence both the good disposition of their minds, and the sincere intention of their hearts, beyond the Preachers, of whatsoever Sect: Their manifold Writings witness enough the solidity and quickness of their wits; and even their Wonders and Miracles in latter ages, in all most Authentick Records of History, would make believe they want not the assistance of the Spirit, yea, and of the power of God; and yet that we should think that they are blinded, Protestants see clear; they mistake Scripture; Protestants take it aright; they are misled by the Spirit of Errour, Protestants directed by the Spirit of Truth; what Reason, Proof, or Probability for this? But why do Protestants pretend it is so? Forsooth chiefly, because they acknowledge one high Bishop in the whole Church, as Protestants a primate in each Kingdom, with the Negative voice to silence all private sowers of Dissention, and keep unity; because they take the Canons and Rules of their Faith from Scripture explained in general Councils, and the Unanimous consent of the Church and Fathers; and not by private Reading; because in a word they reverence Publick Authority establish'd by God in his Church, above particular Opinions and Conceits. Why then should Scripture be called a Ground to Protestants; who neither

did receive it from Christ and his Apostles (as all Historians, and Chronologues marking the rise of Protestancy in *Luther* his dayes do evidence) nor have it uncorrupt, as their own Doctors, and Gospellers do acknowledge: Nor take it in the true sense upon publick Authority, but as they fancy upon private Reading, and Interpretation against the Apostle? And not rather to Catholicks, who having received the Scriptures from Christ and his Apostles, as the Word of God, left to his Church, which she is bound to have an Eye to in all her Decisions, Statutes, and Laws; so that none of them be Repugnant to it in the least, neither by adding or pairing in Words or Sense, but all fully consonant and conform to both: In acknowledgement whereof, in all her General Councils, she placeth it above Pope, Prelates, Pastors, who in all the search they make into former Councils, Fathers, Schoolmen, Tradition or practice of the Church, intend nothing else (generally speaking) then to find out by all possible diligence, the true sense and meaning of what is taught us in General and Particular Terms in the Written Word. Yet Protestants with all Hereticks most vainly bragg of Scripture as their Ground, and Catholicks be calumniated to abandon it, as if Loyal Subjects did not rely on the Acts of Parliament, and fundamental Laws, who receive them, their Sentence

tence, and meaning from the lawful Judges established in the Kingdom; then Out-laws and Rebels pretending to adhere immediately to them, as they themselves read, Think them clear, or expound.

SECT. V.

Scripture however clear in Fundamentals, clearly mistaken by Protestants, and clearly making against them.

Let us come at last to the Fundamental Points of the Protestant Religion, which Mr. Menzeis holds out to be clear in Scripture. Whereupon his Adversary demands, what things he esteems Fundamental? He Answers, to ask a Catalogue of Fundamentals, is to ask how to make a Coat to the Moon in all her changes. And this his quick Reply he borrows, from a learned Divine, as he calls him, (Mr. Chillingworth is the man, as I conceive, for he has the same words, a meer Sceptick in Religion, and who takes away all certainty in Faith) and to say true, the Protestant Religion is so Obnoxious to

Reformations ; Alterations ; Innovations ; that it is most fitly compared by him to the Moon in all her changes. Yea Protestants are of so different Opinions, even in what they call Fundamentals, that scarce two set down the same, *Perkins* in *Cath. Reform.* p. 407. and in his *Exposition of the Creed*, p. 303. will have all Fundamentals included in the *Apostles Creed*. *Dupleffis* in his *Treatise of the Church*, C. 5. in the *Decalogue*. *Du Moulin*, after *Melancton* in C. 4. *Matt.* the *Creed* and *Decalogue*. *Luther Tom.* 7. in *Enchir.* f. 118. in the *Creed*, *Decalogue*, and *Lords Prayer*. *Whitaker Contr.* 1. q. 4. p. 340. in the *Creed*, *Lords Prayer*, and *Sacraments*. *Sadeel Præf. Resp. ad Furr.* to believe *Christ crucified*, and the *Pope* to be *Antichrist*. *Chillingworth* in his *Treatise Intituled, the Religion of Protestants a safe way to Salvation*, p. 408. n. 35. says plainly, Protestants do not agree, touching what Points are Fundamental, and page 166, we know not precisely, just how much is Fundamental : Again page 23. he that will go about to distinguish what was written, because it was profitable, from what was written, because necessary, shall find an intricate business of it, and almost impossible, that he should be certain, he hath done it, when he hath done it. Wherefore he says in the same page, n. 27. that Protestants give not a Catalogue of Fundamentals, it is not from *Tergiversation*, but from *Wisdom and Necessity*, and when they had done it, it had been to no purpose,

pose, there being, as matters now stand, as great necessity of believing those Truths of Scripture, which are not Fundamental, as those that are. And yet other Protestants with M. Menzeis, harp upon nothing more then the Distinction of Fundamentals from not Fundamentals, as if those were necessarily believed, these not. I know in other places of the same Treatise, this Author contradicts himself, which shews not only Protestants disagree in Fundamentals, one from another, but even the same man from himself; so well grounded they are in these their Fundamentals and Grounds, wherein, notwithstanding their monstrous Divisions, they vainly bragg to agree. But how can it be discerned, whether all Protestants, or a few agree in Fundamentals, unless it be precisely known, what and how many Fundamentals there be? Potter, in fine, extends the number of Fundamentals beyond all his Brethren have said; his words are, page 24. *it is Fundamental to a Christians Faith, and necessary for his salvation, that he believe all revealed Truths of God, whereof he may be convinced they are of God.* And doth not this diversity of Opinions equal the changes of the Moon? Or is not all this a most clear and manifest Demonstration, however Scripture be clear in Fundamentals (which now I do not dispute) at least it is not so even to the Learnedst and most sharp sighted Protestants, who so little agree in that

Point, that scarce two are of the same Judgment and Mind. If others did thus mistake what is perspicuous in Scripture, Mr. *Menzeis* would presently tell us, no wonder they do so, by reason of their evil disposed intellect. But that Protestants, and these not of the Vulgar sort, but even the Pillars of their Religion, and Defenders of their Faith, by Volumes in Print, should not see what in Scripture is most clear, but so vary and divide in such a multiplicity of Opinions, and yet maintain Scripture in these same things, wherein they so vary, is clear, what a wonderful thing is this? Or who I pray you, can trust men, both at once saying Scripture is clear in Fundamentals, and yet setting down the same Fundamentals diversly? By this plainly confessing either their own blindness, and so that they are not good Guides, nor to be believed, when they speak of what in Scripture is clear, or else that their Doctrine in this is false.

What M. *Menzeis* holds Fundamental, so great a secret it is, that neither will he tell us himself, nor can any other know it, he having so often changed House, and built upon diverse Grounds. Yet that he should not seem to say nothing, a mark he gives us, to know what in Scripture is Fundamental, to wit, *if we find it commanded to be believed by all, or a Character of necessity to be put upon it.*

Where-

Whereupon I reflect first M. Menze's Doctrine is here very Incoherent, for both he teaches, it is commanded in Scripture all men believe Fundamentals, as things absolutely necessary to salvation; and nevertheless the Catalogue of these samethings, he will have impossible, as a Coat to the Moon. Would not this argue he is ignorant himself, of what all should know and believe? Otherwise surely, he should never have judged this Catalogue impossible, it being casie to a man to call to memory what he knows, yea we know no more then we can call to memory, says the Roman Orator, *Tantum scimus, quantum memoria tenemus.*

Secondly, I reflect, that rejecting the Infalible Authority of the Church, teaching every particular person what is Fundamental, and what we must necessarily know, and explicitly believe to attain salvation; & pretending all this is clear, and may be found, by the marks he has given in Scripture; he remains obliged to a very hard task. 1. To prove in General, from evident and clear Scripture, that all things necessary to be believed are clear and evident in Scripture. Let him answer then, First where he reads this, and to the Fathers teaching the contrary as we shall see below. 2. To prove every Fundamental Point in particular immediately, and clearly from Scripture: And this so, that the words cannot be taken obviously and literally

terally in any other sense. For if they can be so taken, then I have no Infallible Evidence but they should be so taken, without some Infallible Guide, telling me they should not be so taken in the place alledged. As for example, these words, *This is my Body*, undoubtedly may at least signifie, and that most Obviously and Literally, that Christs Body is really in the Sacrament, as when I say, this is a piece of Gold, this a piece of Silver, these words literally signifie real Gold and Silver: Wherefore, if I will take the words Figuratively, as clearly so spoken in Scripture, some other place of Scripture must be brought, or some other Infallible Authority, telling me this in expresse words, otherwise I cannot have that certainty of it, which is required in Divine Faith. 3. Amongst all the clear places in Scripture, to pick out the Fundamental ones, how hard is it for every one? Not to say Morally impossible, M. Menzeis himself granting he cannot do it, more then make a Coat to the Moon. For by this means all should be obliged to know all Texts of Scripture, and then to examine diligently each one, first, whether it be evident or obscure, least it should appear upon examination to be evident, which at the first sight did not seem so. And secondly, Whether it be generally commanded, and have a Character of necessity to be believed by all, for then according to M. Menzeis Rule, I know it

it to be a Fundamental, but *Chillingworth*; his learned Divine, tells him a little above, *so distinguish what was written because it was profitable, from what was written, because necessary*, is an intricate piece of business. S. Paul to the Heb. 2. C. 6. V. requires no more as necessary (as would seem) then that he who cometh to God, believe, he is, and that he is a rewarder of them who diligently seek him. S. *John* 3. Ch. 6. says, he, that believeth in the Son, hath everlasting life; the Prophet *Royal*, that all who fear the Lord are blessed; and many other such passages there be in Scripture, which might make a man think one thing or two at most were necessary to Salvation, as sometimes the believing of one Point, sometimes the doing of one good action; Heaven is promised to Prayer in one place, full Remission of sins to Alms deeds in another, &c. and yet who will say either of these two is sufficient for working a mans Salvation? Add to all this, I find in Scripture, *If thou wilt enter into life, keep the Commandments*, S. *Matth.* 19. Yet Protestants teach that to be impossible, and consequently this Fundamental must lead all to despair, as that other make all to presume; it being a Fundamental again amongst Protestants, that every man should believe he is one of the Elect, which being an Article of his Faith, may reasonably secure him, and yet all not being of this number, some from this Fundamen-
tal

tal must or should at least presumptuously believe a lye. Further the eating of blood and strangled meat, is generally forbidden by the Apostles, to all the *Gentiles* converted to the Christian Faith, as it was before to the *Jews*, whence I infer; what is generally commanded to all, should generally be believed by all; and so if *M. Menzeis Rule* be good, this must come in amongst the Fundamentals of the Protestant Religion; which if it be so in the Pulpit I know not, but at Table I am sure it is not. A hundred such absurdities follow, upon seeking Fundamentals in Scripture, by these deceiving signes and uncertain marks *M. Menzeis* gives us, without any Infallible Guide.

2. It is to be remarked, that Protestants neither agree in setting down Fundamentals, nor can give a precise Catalogue of Points of Faith, they think to be Fundamental, as was required of *M. Menzeis*; but that also they mistake the very Notion and name: A Fundamental verity in the Christian Religion, being either that which makes us believe all the rest, or without the express knowledge and belief whereof, none can be saved. Now the Question amongst us, is not about this; but whether a Man may either suspend his assent, or positively dissent, from lesser things then these, when they are revealed by God, and propounded to him by the same Authority with the former. For then say Catholicks he is equally

equally obliged to believe them, by reason of the formal Object, which is Divine Revelation, & can in nothing deceive, or should in any thing be called in question, though in respect of the Material Object or thing revealed, we be not so obliged to know it. For there is nothing less or more certain when God speaks, he being the first Verity, yea verity it self, who delivers all he says with one and the same Infinite Certainty, where no degrees, of more or less certitude can have place.

Protestants it would seem, as they take Fundamentals, will not be eyed to this, whence they receive in communion with them, and as the true Members of their Church, some who hold most contrary Tenets, as M. Menzeis, the Waldenses, Wickliffians, Hussites, who in his seventh Paper grants *the whole body of the Church collectively taken, cannot err in Essentials or Fundamentals, yet so as that in some whole ages the Integrals may be vitiated.* But if he understand by Integrals lesser Points of Faith, as to their Object and Matter, yet equally revealed by God, and propounded by his Church to us, with chief Mysteries, (wherein the Protestants mistake, and Error in their Distinction of Fundamentals and Integrals consists) his Assertion is both Erroneous & Heretical, because an Act of Faith grounded on the Motive of Gods Infinite and infallible Veracity in revealing, is a Virtual and Implicite Belief of all he has revealed, so that
the

the true Belief of one Article, implyes a belief of all. Wherefore S. Athanasius says in his Creed, *whosoever doth not hold the Catholick Faith whole and inviolate, he shall perish for ever.* And S. Hierome l. 3. contr. Ruff. for one word or two contrary to the Faith, many Hereticks have been cast out of the Church. Yea, S. Gregory Naz. tract. de fide, says, nothing can be more dangerous then those Hereticks, who when they run through all things uprightly, yet with one word, as with a drop of poyson corrupts the true and sincere Faith of our Lord, and of Apostolical Tradition. S. Basil as Theodoret reports l. 4. Hist. c. 6. being desired to relent a little to the time, Answered, That such as were instructed in the Divine Doctrine, do not suffer any Syllable to be corrupt, but for its defence if need require, willingly embrace any kind of death. And the Church in her Publick Decrees of General Councils strikes with the Thunder bolt of Gods Curse and Excommunication all such as refuse to believe any one Point decided to be of Faith, which she could not justly do, if every Article she declares were not necessarily believed, when known to be decided by her. So doth the Church of England Excommunicate all who hold any thing contrary to the 39. Articles, though they judg them not all Fundamental. As the Athenians punished without remission the least word against the received opinion of their Gods, and the Jews (says Joseph contra Appion.) the

the least transgression of the Law. So God threat-
 neth that he shall be blotted out of the Book of
 Life, who ever shall diminish any word of the
 Revelation, *Apoc. 22. v. 19.* Yet *Luther* reject-
 ing whole Epistles of Scripture, in *M. Menzeis*
 Book is called a holy man; but so speaketh not
Luther of him denying the Real Presence, who in
 his Book against the Sacramentarians, says plain-
 ly, *They believe in God the Father, Son, and Holy*
Ghost in vain, all these things avail them nothing,
for as much as they deny, this Article of the Real
Presence, and attach him of falshood, who said of
the Sacrament, This is my Body. And he had
 reason, for *St. Thomas 2. 2. q. 5. a 3.* with other
 Divines teach he has no Spiritual Faith, who
 believeth not every thing little or great, Fun-
 damental or not, Proposed to him by the same
 Authority. Whereupon they infer, that no Se-
 ctary upon his own choice adhering to this or
 that, believeth any thing. So *Tertullian, l. de*
præsc. speaking against *Valentine*, says, *some things*
of the Law and Prophets he approveth, some things
not, that is, disalloweth all, whilst he dispro-
vetb some.

3. From all this appeareth, how idly this distin-
 ction of fundamentals, & non-fundamentals in the
 Protestants sense was brought in by them, it ser-
 ving to no other purpose, then to palliate their di-
 visions at present, & deceive Ignorants in the pre-
 tended succession, they claim to in old condemn'd

Hereticks, whose Errors they will have to be no Fundamentals. As M. Menzeis taking *Hieronymus of Prague*, *John Huss*, *Wickeliff*, the *Waldenses*, and *Gregians*, for true Protestants, before *Luther*, to make up an imaginary Succession in the Protestant Church: which to do with any apparent shew of Truth. 1. He should prove those Sects to have been the Catholick Church spread through the whole world, and owned as such by the Fathers of those times. 2. Justifie their Doctrine, which we find partly in their own Writings; partly in the most Authentick Records of the Ages wherein they lived, to have been in many things most false, erroneous, and unchristian. 3. Their succession from the Apostles times, finding their Bishops and Pastors in the Registers of the Church History or Fathers. Neither will he make this good by the Authority of *Friar Reiner*, who speaking of the *Waldenses*, whom he names *Lionists*, says at most (even as *Iliricus* quotes his words) *some affirm they have been from the time of Pope Sylvester others from the dayes of the Apostles*. (M. Menzeis to make the Argument stronger, will have *Friar Reiner* to say absolutely they were from the time of the Apostles, with his ordinary ingenuity) but what I pray you concludes he from this? Those who said so, being *Lionists* themselves, as witnesseth *Placidorphus*. So a little before *Waldo*, there arose Hereticks who falsly

faſtly bragged of the ſame, even as after them
Proteſtants do now. But if you or they either
fir, were in all ages from the Apoſtles, tell us
the Authours in every age who marked the ſuc-
ceſſion of your Paſtors, where lived your peo-
ple, &c. & then refute the great number of learn-
ed Writers, who lived when ſuch Sects did ſtart
up in a ſuddain, as a Muſhrome in a night, mark-
ing their Riſe, and noting their Errours, which
certainly they had never done, if ſuch Doctrine
had been profeſſed before, as that of the true
and viſible Church.

But to ſpeak a word in particular of every one
of thoſe Sects; with what ignorance and falſhood
Mr. Menzeis calls them true Proteſtants, you ſhall
preſently ſee. And firſt in *John Huſs*, to whoſe
name, I am ſure, he has a more juſt claim than to
his Religion, if we truſt all the moſt Authentick
Records of *Huſs* his Doctrine, &c.

I cite not for this the Juridick Acts of the
Council at *Conſtance*, becauſe Popiſh; not Fa-
ther *Gordon* of *Huntley*, no leſs eminent for his
Learning than Birth, becauſe a Jeſuit, though
living in *Prague* in *Boheme*, where *Huſſites* moſt
abound, and having made moſt diligent enqui-
ry of their Tenents, he found as he witneſſeth,
Cent. 3. de Euch. c. 17. they did hold Invocati-
on of Saints, Prayer for the dead, the Faſtings
and Ceremonies of the Catholick Church with
free will, confeſſion of Sins, ſeven Sacraments, &c.

But

But I hope he will trust Fox, a most fiery Protestant speaking thus upon the 2. Ch. of the Revelation. *What did Huss at any time teach or defend in the Council, wherein he did not seem superstitiously to consent with the Papists? what did the Popish Faith decree concerning Transubstantiation, which he likewise with the Papists did not confirm? who celebrated Mass more Religiously then he? or more Religiously observed the Vows of Priestly Chastity? Concerning Free Will, Predestination, informed Faith, (that is without Charity) the cause of Justification, and merit of good Works, what other thing did he hold, then is taught at Rome? All this he, and more in his Monuments, that he did acknowledge seven Sacraments, and the Popes Supremacy, p. 216. and 227. And if he should as yet disown Fox as a private Writer, yet must he trust Luther as a man extraordinarily sent by God to Reform the Church, and the 14. Apostle: The Papists burned Huss, says he, (Colloq. Germ. C. de Antich.) when as yet he departed not a fingers breadth from the Papacy, for he taught the same which the Papists do, only he found fault with their Vices, against the Pope he did nothing. To the same purpose Luther has much more, Tom. 2. in Assert. art. 30. and Tom. 3. in Pl. 2. But in fine, should not Huss himself be trusted better then any, his works are extant, and perusing them, you shall find he did hold seven Sacraments upon the fifth of*

S.

S. James; Transubstantiation in his Book of the Lords Supper, Ch. 2. and 3. the Sacrifice of the Mass in his Sermon of Funerals; Purgatory, and Prayers for the Dead in the same place, confession of sins to a Priest in his Treatise of penance, invocation of Saints in his Epistles 22. 30. 35. Veneration of Relicks upon Ps. 115. yea in his question of believing the Popes Supremacie as to his office, dignity and power: though with this Caveat, common to him with Wickliff, that ecclesiastical dignity, as well as Civil, was grounded on Inherent Justice, and so lost by Mortal Sin, which neither Catholicks nor Protestants do teach: Nevertheless M. Menzeis is not ashamed to own Huss for a Protestant, so constant is he in professing his Fundamentals, which he will have to be in Scripture so clear. I insist not so much on the rest, yet to say a little of every one. Of Hierome of Prague; Fox. pag. 585, relateth whatever was his Opinion in other things, yet stood he constantly in defence of the real Presence, and Transubstantiation, saying, he did give more credit to S. Augustine, and other Doctors of the Church (who affirmed the same) then to any that denyed it. Wickliff again M. Menzeis is not ashamed to call a Protestant, who in his own Writings so expressly holds against them. 1. Worship of Images in his 9. Ch. of the Eucharist, Images, says he, we adore purely as signs, but God we must adore with all our power: It is therefore granted, that Relicks,

H

Images,

Images, and the Sacraments be with prudence to be adored. He did also hold Invocation of Saints in his Sermon of the Assumption into Heaven of our blessed Lady, Auricular confession on the 3. Ch. of James, seven Sacraments in his Postscript on the first Ep. and 1. Ch. to the Corinthians. Wherefore Melancton Ep. ad Micon. thus censures him, I have read Wickliff and found in him many Errors, he never held nor understood Justice of Faith, which is the Protestants main Fundamental. With the same confidence M. Menzeis calls the Waldenses Protestants, who held the Real Presence, that the Apostles were but Lay-men, that all Magistrates fall from their Dignity by mortal sin, that it is not lawful to swear in any case, &c. as witnesseth Illyricus in Catal. Wald. Confess. Bohem. &c. And with these the Grecians upon a private Letter sent (as he pretends) by a Patriarch to the Arch-Bishop of Canterbury; though all who ever conversed with Grecians know, they say daily Mass, hold Transubstantiation, seven Sacraments, Prayer to the Saints, and for the dead, &c. as all may see in the censure of the Oriental or Grecian Church; and deny the procession of the Holy Ghost from the Son, and consequently make no distinction betwixt these two Persons in the Godhead. But it is enough to M. Menzeis it seems, that they disown the Pope, to be called Protestants, and so Turks and Tartars may come in with them. Whence I leave to judge how

how constant a Protestant M. Menzel is, owning such Doctors and Doctrine, and what Credit again he deserves, after so many clear Testimonies, and that even of learned Protestants, and the very writings of the persons in question, convincing him of most notorious falshood and Error.

The most antient and holy Fathers, as *S. Irenæus Tertullian*, *Philastrius*, *S. Epiphanius*, *S. Augustine*, *Theodoret*, *S. John Damascen*, and others, who have written a Catalogue of Heresies, did not certainly distinguish Fundamentals and Integrals amongst Divine Truths, sufficiently propounded, as Protestants do, when they condemned many lesser things as Heresies, and consequently damnable Errours, then what they think to have no repugnancy with Fundamentals and essentials in the Doctrine of the true Church, as in the *Pelagians*, *Novatians*, *Donatists*, *Monothelits*, who all embraced the Trinity, Incarnation, Passion of Christ, &c. *S. Epiphanius*, Heres. 75. and *S. Augustine*, l. de heres. C. 33. condemn the *Arians* for denying the Fasts commanded by the Church, the first remarking, they were accustomed to eat flesh on Fridays, and in the Lent, yea chiefly in the holy Week, wherein Christ died. *S. Hierome* in his 2. book against *Jovinian* condemneth him, for saying Fastings, and all other Exercises of good works, were not meritorious: *S. Augustine* in his Book of Heresies, c.

54. condemns the *Eunomians* for teaching no sin could hurt a man, if so he had but only Faith. *S. Epiphanius* heres. 64. all who denied free will : *S. Hierome, Vigilantius*, in his Book against him for affirming the Relicks of the Saints ought not to be revered : the same *S. Hierome* against *Jovinian* with *S. Augustine* in his Book of Heresies, C. 82. condemn him, for holding Wedlock, equal in dignity and merit to virginity. *S. Augustine* again I. Contr. *Julian*. C. 2. the *Pelagians* for teaching the Children of the Faithful Parents did not need Baptism, but were born holy, and in his 1. Book 2. C. and last against *Maximus*, the *Arians* for not receiving Traditions. Now let *M. Menzeis* choose either to acknowledge all these, and many such like condemned Heresies by the Fathers to be no Fundamentals, and consequently that many other things then these which Protestants call Fundamentals, are necessary to be believed under the danger of incurring Heresie and Eternal damnation : or owning them as such, let him confess, Protestants Err even in Fundamentals with them, seeing all here condemned is Protestant Doctrine, borrowed from those more ancient Hereticks, and condemned by the Fathers even then.

4. As to that he says all Fundamentals are clear in Scripture, and that according to *S. Chrysostome*, *S. Augustine*, *S. Irenaus*, *S. Thomas of Aquine*

Aguine, and *Sixtus Senensis*, holding what ever is obscure in one place, to be clear in some other. I answer, very easily with a manifold distinction, 1. To such eminent Doctors of the Church, as he cites, most Scriptures are clear I grant, to all indifferently I deny. 2. To such as take the places of Scripture commanding us to hear the Church, and hold fast the Traditions of the Apostles conserved in her, as two main Fundamentals, for clearing all the rest, I grant, to others I deny. 3. With *Vincentius Lyrinensis* c. 2, to such as level the Line of Prophetical and Apostolical interpretation, to the square of the Ecclesiastical and Catholick sense I grant, to others I deny. 4. With Doctor *Field* a Protestant in his 4. Book C. 14. to such as be first settled in those things which the Apostles presupposed in their delivery of Scriptures, I grant, to others I deny. Neither are these my Distinctions any wise to shift the Argument, which maketh nothing either against us, or for him. But to clear the Fathers words in the very genuine sense they speak them. See *S. Chrysostome* his meaning in his 14. Hom. on *S. John*. *S. Augustines* contra Cresconium. C. 33. where he says, if any one fear to be deceived in this question, through its obscurity, let him ask Council of the Church, which the holy Scriptures do demonstrate without any ambiguity. That of *S. Irenaus* in his 2. Book Ch. 47.

and more expressly in his 1. Book Ch. 49. *S. Thomas* his words, That *what ever is necessary to be believed under the Spiritual Sense, that some where is manifestly declared by the Letter*, as they do not specify to whom this manifest declaration is made, so we grant it to the Church and her Doctors, for to her *all things are known*, says *St. Irenaeus in which is perfect Faith*, as to the Apostles it was given by our Saviour Christ to know the Mysteries of the Kingdom of Heaven.

5. But I would ask *M. Menzeis* did ever any of these Fathers receive the Scriptures as the undoubted Word of God, otherwise then on the Churches Authority? *S. Augustine* saying, *I would not believe the Scriptures, if the Authority of the Church did not move me to it*, is no less clear for this, then Scripture it self in Fundamentals. Or did ever any of them fancy to himself a place of Scripture, as clear for any thing, the whole Church standing in a contrary Judgment? For this is the only Point we debate with Protestants, and clearly prove both by the Scriptures and Fathers against them.

6. However Scripture be clear in Fundamentals, in the sense I have given, that is particularly, and in as many words, or generally, and as commanding us to hear the Church, yet surely it doth not set down all that is Fundamental in express terms, if we trust the Fathers, whom *M. Menzeis* appeals to, as holding Scripture clear.

clear in Fundamentals; or can all be so evidently deduced from Scripture, but by the Authority of the Church, that Hereticks be silenced, and Unity preserved in Faith. *S. Chrysostome on 2 Thes. 2. says it is evident that the Apostles did not deliver all things by Writing, but many things without, and those be as worthy of credit as others.* Which he could not have said, if Fundamentals were only the infallible Truths, and they clearly revealed in Scripture. *S. Epiphanius, Heres. 61. we must use Traditions, for the Scriptures have not all things; yet no necessity of using Traditions, if all Fundamentals were in Scripture, they only being necessary according to Protestants.* *S. Augustine l. 5. de Bapt. Contr. Donat. Ch. 23. the custome of the Church in baptizing Infants, is neither to be condemned, or any wise thought superfluous, yet not to be believed if it were not an Apostolical Tradition.* If this was not in his Judgment, a Fundamental, hear himself again, *l. 3. de Orig. Anim. C 9. if thou wilt be a Catholick, believe not, teach not, say not, that Infants prevented by death before they are baptized, can come to the pardon of their Original sin.* Is it not a Fundamental to believe Scripture to be the Word of God, which *S. Augustine* takes on Tradition? What if a man should receive the New Testament as sufficiently containing Fundamentals, and reject the Old with the *Manichees*? admit of some of the *Evangelists*, but not

others with the *Ebionites*? What if one should deny the word Person, the name and definition of a Sacrament, the keeping of Sunday, because not clear in Scripture, and consequently no Fundamentals according to M. Menzeis Rule. *Marcion*, and with him the Anabaptists, teach Baptism should be conferred more then once. The *Donatists*, that Baptisme of Hereticks, at least should be reiterated. *Sabellius*, one only Person in the Godhead. *Nestorius*, two Persons in Christ, and for this are accounted Hereticks, yet no clear Scripture is brought condemning their Errours. *S. Augustine* l. de unitate Eccl. says expressely of the *Donatists* Errour, *this neither you nor I read in expresse words.*

7. How many Scriptures are clear against Protestants in all controverted Tenets? So that however it be clear in Fundamentals, it clearly speaketh against them. See for this the Touchstone of the Reformed Gospel; with the Manual of Controversie, and after you have pondered the places quoted in them, judge whether the Protestant Religion be rightly defined by M. Menzeis, *The Christian Religion as contained in Scripture, and their professancy, only their protesting against Popish Errours.* Which Definition if good, having its *Genus proximum & differentiam ultimam*, should distinguish Protestants from all other Sectaries; but this it doth not, it being common to them with most Hereticks, who have

have ever been: all of them professing with you
 Sir, to adhere to the written Word they re-
 ceived, and as understood by themselves, as the
Arians, Nestorians, Pelagians, Photinians, &c.
 and all protesting against the Churches Errours,
 and Popes Authority. For as the sole Roman
 Church did ever oppose all Hereticks, as the
 only zealous Defender of the true Faith and
 Doctrine, which *S. Paul* calls the *Depositum* en-
 trusted to her; So all generally how soon they
 turn Hereticks, Protest, prattle, Preach chiefly
 against her; turn over all the Writings of Au-
 thours, who have made mention of Heresies,
 and you shall find that all from the first to the
 last have opposed themselves to that company of
 Christians, which was in communion with the
 Pope and Bishop of *Rome* for the time; and that
 this company hath opposed it self to them all,
 neither did they oppose themselves all to any o-
 ther company whatsoever. Yea this was ever
 the distinctive mark of Hereticks, not to com-
 municate with the Pope and Sea of *Rome*; as
 may be seen in the Writings of the Fathers. *St.*
Irenaeus l. 3. C. 3. S. Hierome Ep. 57. S. Cyprian,
in Pl. Contr. part. Don. and generally in all ages,
 and by all, so that you protesting with them a-
 gainst the Church and Pope, take their very Badg
 and Eivery, and shamefully declare by this Cha-
 racteristick Mark of your Defection, from the e-

ver acknowledged true Church, and high Bishop thereof, by all the Fathers, your Apostacy, Heresie, and Schism. It is very plausible I must confesse to poor Ignorants, when Preachers make them believe they teach nothing, save only the pure Scripture and written Word, protesting against all unwritten Traditions as Popish Errors. But if any man consider a little with himself your Tenets in particular, he shall presently find, it is openly against God, and his written Word ye protest, in all points of Controversie, under the false pretence of protesting against Popery; and that not so much as one Tenet peculiar to you is contained in Scripture. This I evidence in most Articles of Popish Doctrine you protest against, where all may see and judge how well your Religion is contained in Scripture.

Is it not to protest against the goodness of God to say with you, he created some for Hell independently, of their works, and likewise against his Word, *1 Tim. 2.* where it is said, *he will have all to be saved,* and in the *2. Ep. of St. Peter 3.* where he is declared not willing any should perish.

Is it not to protest against his Mercy, and express word again, to say he died not for all? The Apostle *S. Paul* assuring he did die for all, *and as that in Adam all died, so in Christ all be restored to life, 1 Cor. 15.*

Is it not to protest against his Justice and Word, to teach that he punisheth us for what we cannot do, as for the want of good Works, which Protestants will have not to be in our power. Yet the Apostle says, *Heb. 6. 10. God is not unjust that he should forget our work.*

Is it not to protest against the Wisdom and Word of God, to say he obliges us to perform things impossible, as Protestants call the Commandements? where as Saint *Joh. in 1 Ep. C. 5. says they are not so much as heavy.*

Is it not to protest against his Veracity and Word, to affirm that the Church can teach Errors, and stand in need of Reformation; Christ having commanded us to hear it, in *S. Matt. 18. and the Apostle S. Paul 1 Tim. 3. calling it the Pillar and Ground of Truth.*

Is it not to protest against his Providence and Word, to assert that he has given us the dead Letter of the Law, without an Infallible Visible Judge, leaving to every poor Ignorant, to Interpret Scripture according to his fancy, *S. Peter* having said, *no Scripture is of private interpretation*, and Christ having commanded us *to hear his Church.*

Is it not to protest against the Efficacy of Christs Mediation, Sufferings, Death, and also his Word, to hold that he hath freed us from the pain, but not from the guilt of sin, *S. Joh. 1. Rev. 5. Saying he washed us from our sins in his own*

own blood. And *S. Paul*, 1 *Cor.* 6. we are *Washed, justified, Sanctified.*

Is it not to protest against his Divine Order, to tie our Sanctification to Faith only, and his expresse word in *S. James* 2. 24. *Ye see then how that by Works a man is justified, and not by Faith only.*

Is it not to protest against his Divine Appointment again and his Word, to teach that good Works done in his Grace, and by his Grace, merit nothing? when through all the Scripture Heaven is promised as a reward to our Works, and in *Sr. Matth.* 10. it is said, *Christ shall render to every one according to his Works.*

Is it not to protest against his Divine Authority and Word, to deny the Real Presence? All the Evangelists speaking so clearly, *This is my Body, this is my Blood.*

Is it not to protest against his expresse Command and Word, to forbid Images as Idols? He having ordered *two Cherubims to be set on the Ark of the Covenant*, *Exod.* 25.

Is it not to protest against his own Practice and Word, to deny we should honour his Saints, whom God himself Honours, yea, and glorifies. *Them that honour me, I will honour*, 1 *Reg.* 2. 30.

Is it not to protest against his Dispensation and Word, to deny the Power given to his
A postles

Aposiles and their Successours to forgive sins? he having said in S. *John* 20. 23. *Whose sins ye shall forgive, they are forgiven.*

Is it not to protest against the Satisfaction which his Justice requires for our sins, even after the guilt is forgiven, to deny Purgatory? The Scripture witnessing that he did exact satisfaction of *David*, and many holy penitent sinners after he had forgiven their sins. And S. *Paul*, 1 *Cor.* 3. *If any ones work burn, he shall suffer loss, but himself shall be saved, yet so as by fire;* where we have clearly a purging, and punishing, yet saving fire.

Is it not to protest against Christs Eternal Priesthood, according to the order of *Melchisedech*, Ps. 109. and S. *Paul*, *Hebr.* 5. to reject the unbloody and unspotted Sacrifice of the Mass, which the Prophet *Malachy* 1. C. 10. V. calls a clean Oblation to be offered amongst the Gentiles, from the rising of the Sun, even to the setting, and that in every place.

Is it not to protest against all God commands us and his Word? to take away free Will in obeying, *Deut.* 30. 19. *I have set before you life and death, chuse.*

To conclude, what Point is there in all the Catholick Faith, which Protestants protest against, which is not either Directly against Gods Divine Attributes, Christs Mediation, and Dispensation, his Churches Authority, his Saints,
and

and Servants honour, some part of Christian duty, belief, or life, or generally not against his expresse written Word, as it is plain in it self, or expounded, by the unanimous consent of the Fathers? And yet so impudently bold is this spirit of Heresie, as to dare say, that that is contained in Scripture, which Scripture most evidently contradicts; that is only in opposition to Popish Errours, which impugnes the very Fundamental, and most substantial Verities of the Gospel and Christian Faith; that by the pure and uncorrupted word, it will reform the Church, when corrupting the Word, and correcting the Church as subject to failings, and Errours in Religion, it ruinateth both Church and Word.

What

What has been said in this, and the former Section, further instanced in two Particular Controverted Points; The Real Presence, and two Sacraments.

THE Protestant Religion is, The Christian Religion as contained in Scripture: Sole Scripture is their Ground, and in it all Fundamentals are clear; Says M. Menzeis. How false all this is in general, doth evidently I hope appear, by what I have said above. Here I instance only further two particular Points, he handles at length, the better to make see the falshood of his strong and bold Assertions, in the weakness and nullity of his Proofs. And this first in his refuting one of our chief Tenets, viz. The Real Presence, then in maintaining one of his own, to wit, That there are two Sacraments, and no more.

1. Then

1. Then to prove Christs body is not really in the Sacrament, these most clear words, *This is my body*; must not, says he, be taken in the literal sense, but Figuratively: why so, doth the Scripture say this? no, no Scripture is brought. What then? a Philosophical Demonstration as he pretends. *The word this, in the literal sense is inexplicable, and the Proposition impliyeth a contradiction, ergo &c.* But why the Pronoun *this* inexplicable, because let *Romanists* strain their wits, Answers M. Menzeis, and squeeze their Authors, they cannot tell what it can signifie, whether the Bread, Body, or something indeterminately. Who would not laugh here to see Mr. Menzeis, a professor of Divinity take such a weak Argument for a Demonstration? most like in this to a certain Romantick Knight Errand call'd *Don Quixot*, who imagining to himself a Windmill to be a Gyant, and then fighting with it, as with a Hector, he did both blunt his Sword, and batter his Reputation. For what, I pray you, doth the Pronoun *this* signifie in any proposition, but Indeterminately, till it be determined to some particular thing, by the following words. So that let a man say a hundred times *this*, he determines nothing but by the ensuing words, as here *This is my Body*, makes a determinated sense, the last words determining the first, which alone, and of it self signifies nothing determinately, and so to seek what it signifies

signifies determinately alone; and before the other words be pronounced, is to quibble and speak non-sense, by seeking a determinate Object under a word, which of its nature hath none. And this is the first part of his Demonstration for establishing, by a Logick Sophism, without any clear Scripture, a main Point of Religion.

The second part of this Demonstration is, *That it implyes a manifest contradiction; a true Affirmative Proposition, de presenti, should produce its Object.* Why this, because in the instant of Nature wherein the Proposition is conceiv'd before its Object, as the cause before its Effect; the Proposition should be true as is supposed, and not true, because the Object in that instant is not. The same Argument he urgeth in the instant of time wherein the Copula is pronounced, or Particle *is*, before the two last words. And for that Catholick Authours give many and diverse Solutions of this Argument, as the Custome is in the School, he will be satisfied with none. But because Mr. Menzeis is good at Retortions, I retort his Argument thus: Is not this a true Affirmative Proposition, *de presenti*, which produces its Object in St. John 15. *This is my command, that ye love one another.* Now what difficulty in the former Proposition, either in the word *this*, or in the Instants of Nature

and Time; or that a true affirmative Proposition make its own Object, which is not here? do not these words make a new Command says Christ, as the former his body? what if M. Menzeis could have brought an Axiome of Philosophy against the Real Presence (as that Maxime, so commonly propounded and answered in the School, *que sunt eadem cum uno tertio sunt eadem inter se*) proving as would seem, that the three persons being Identified, and the same thing with the Godhead and Divine Nature, cannot be really distinguished one from another. Should a Christian bely Christ, who is the first Verity, upon pretence he speaketh against natural reason? who will so reason with God, let him hear S. Bernards most Excellent saying, Bp. 109. *What is more against Reason, then that one should strive to go beyond Reason by force of Reason.* But true it is, no Mystery of our Faith is against Reason, though some there be above the reach of Humane Weakness. Wherefore as the former Maxime, though much stronger, then what M. Menzeis here objects, is shown to have no repugnancy with the distinction of persons by our Divines; So I easily answer him, the Proposition is true in the instant of Nature, the Object being only extant in the instant of Time wherein the Proposition is compleatly ended, because it affirmeth only its Object to be extant, in that instant of time, and not before.

In that instant of Nature, wherein the Proposition precedes its Object, it affirms indeed the Object to be, but not for that instant, as I say truly this day what will be to morrow; *In instanti natura vera est propositio, sed non pro instanti natura*, say they in the School. But M. Menzeis Argument if solid, would prove against all Philosophy; there could be no Practick Knowledge, which hath no real Object, but what it makes to it self, for that in such conceptions of the mind, the act of the understanding is ever prior to the Object, as its cause; and so in that instant of priority (if his Objection have place) we shall have a knowledge of nothing, because in it the Object is not. Yea it should prove in all these places of Scripture, *Let the Light be made, let the Firmament be made, young man I say unto thee rise; I will, be thou healed*, and in such like, the Omnipotent Word of God not to be effectual, if the words did not produce what they signify, as these other words, *This is my body*. So that M. Menzeis here, taking this his trifling, & whimsical Sophism, for an unanswerable Argument, shews not only his weakness both in Philosophy and Grammar, but also manifestly that Hereticks contradict Christs most clear words, and the Authority of his Church upon most insignificant and frivolous objections. And upon such trifling Sophisms shall any Christian refuse to believe, what Christ hath taught in so express

terms? what the Evangelists have so accurately set down in holy Writ: what the Fathers have confirmed in so many Volumes: what the Martyrs have subscribed with their blood: what the Church doth testifie by her Pastors and practise: what God hath sealed with so many Miracles and Wonders; sometime, appearing in the Consecrate Host in form of a man; sometimes (when it has been stabbed by Jews and Hereticks) making it gush out in blood; sometimes by its vertue, casting out Devils, or quenching fire, as so many Authentick Records, both of History and Fathers do witness. O boldness and impudence of Heresie so to cavil at Christs own words; and yet proudly pretend, pure Scripture is its only Ground!

2. To instance how M. Menzeis again, from Scripture clear in Fundamentals, proves that Fundamental Tenet of Protestants, yea their proper and only Tenet (all the rest being borrowed from old condemned Heresies, as we have seen.) *There be two Sacraments and no more.* After a huge work in his last Paper, and a whole year spent, before the answer to this Query did appear, instead of clear Scripture (which he was only desired to bring) he gives the following discourse.

1. To clear the state of the Question, he says, *know we do not affirm, that the word Sacrament is to be found in Scripture.*

2. We understand by a Sacrament of the New Testament, a Substantial Visible Sign instituted by God, recorded in the Gospel, to Seal up the Promises of Salvation, which is to endure in the Church to the end of the world.

3. We do affirm in this sense, there be only two proper Sacraments in the New Testament, Baptisme and the Lords Supper.

4. Then coming to prove there be two Sacraments, and two only; that there be two, he proves it thus, to Baptisme and the Lords Supper, agree all the parts of the foresaid Description, for you have, says he, the Divine Institution of Baptizing with water, Mat. 28. 19. and of the Lords Supper, 1 Cor. 11. 23, 24, 25. That they are Seals of the promises of Salvation is no less clear. And first of Baptisme, Act. 2. 38, 39. and also of the Lords Supper, in so much that the Cup is called the New Testament, which you must acknowledge to be no proper speech, but it is only so called, because it is, *sigillum fœderis*; hence also in the Institution, mention is made of the remission of sins, and of the giving of the Body of Christ; and shedding of his blood for us, holding forth that forgiveness of sins, and all other blessings, purchased by the Death of Christ, and promised in the new Covenant; are by this Ordinance sealed to the people of God. And that these Ordinances are to continue to the end of the world, is no less manifest from Matt. 28. 20, and 1 Cor. 11. 26. In fine, he proves there

there be only two Sacraments, by this Argument, more cannot be produced out of Scripture, as shall be proved, *Solutione objectionum ergo, &c.*

Now to reflect how judiciously, and learnedly M. Menzeis here proves from Scripture there be two Sacraments, and two only.

1. He doth not affirm the Word Sacrament to be in Scripture.

2. Of all the Definition or Description he brings, not so much as one Particle is affirmed in Scripture to be Essential to a Sacrament: (I do not dispute at present how much of it is true in it self, or granted by us) I only desire it may be made clear from Scripture, as clearly containing all Fundamentals of the Protestant Religion, which is the only thing in question. But nothing is proved by him, save only that Baptism, and the Lords Supper are of Divine Institution, as many other things be, which are not Sacraments. To prove they are Seals of the promises of Salvation, he cites for Baptism, *Act. 2. 28, 29.* The words omitted by him, I hear set down. *But Peter said to them, do penance, and be every one of you Baptized in the name of Jesus Christ for remission of your sins, and you shall receive the gift of the Holy Ghost: for to you is the promise, and to your children, and to all that are far off, whomsoever the Lord our God shall call.* No word here Baptism is a Seal of

of the promises of Salvation. It is said indeed to be given for the Remission of sins, and that to whom it is given, they receive the gifts of the Holy Ghost, which both Protestants deny; maintaining there is no virtue in Baptism to confer either of these Effects. It is said further, that to the Jews and their children, yea to all that God shall call, promise is made, but that Baptism is a Seal of the promise of Salvation, neither the Text, nor any consequence he draweth from it doth evince it.

The way he proves from Scripture, the Lords Supper to be a Seal of the promises of Salvation, is rare; for that says he, *it is called the New Testament, which we must acknowledge to be no proper speech, but to be only so called, because it is, Sigillum faderis.* This is his Commentary on the Text; but what a necessary and clear consequence is this? If ever such a consequence as clearly deduced from Scripture was heard of, I leave it to the Reader to judg; So clearly are the Sacraments, and main Fundamentals of the Protestant Religion, contained in Scripture, or clearly deduced from it.

But M. Menzeis thought it (as it seems by his so long a digression in his last paper) a more easie task to impugne our Sacraments (though no part of the present work) then to prove his own. *No Scripture, Councils, or Fathers hold out seven Sacraments.* Answer, yes Sir, both

Scripture, Councils, Fathers do, not as bare signs with you, but as visible or sensible signs of the invisible grace they produce in the Soul, as instituted by Christ our Lord, for our Sanctification. In this sense, there be seven Sacraments set down in the Gospel, Decreed by Councils, approved by the Fathers. And That the Fathers did so understand a Sacrament, is confessed by Protestants, who even dare censure the Fathers for this: As *Musculus* loc. comm. p. 299. did *S. Augustine*, for affirming confidently, that the Sacraments of the New Testament give salvation; *Zwinglius*, Tom. 2. de Bapt. fol. 70. All the Antient Doctors for supposing the water of Baptism to purge sin. The Century Writers, Cent. 2. C. 4. Col. 47. In particular censures, *S. Clement* Disciple of the Apostles, and *Justin Martyr*, for thinking Regeneration not only to be signified, but wrought by Baptism: and in the 3. Cent. C. 4. *S. Cyprian*, for teaching that the person Baptizing doth give Sanctity, and the Holy Ghost, to the Baptized.

2 That such a number of visible or sensible signs instituted by Christ, for conferring grace, and taking away sin, is set down in Scripture, is clear from the following Texts. Of Baptism, *Acts* 2. 38. *Be every one of you baptized for the Remission of Sins.* *Ephes.* 5. 25. *Christ*

Christ loved the Church, cleansing it by the Word of Water.

For Confirmation, Acts 17. Then they did impose their hands upon them, and they received the Holy Ghost. 2 Cor. 1. 22. And he that confirmeth us with you in Christ, and hath anointed us, God who also hath sealed us, and given the pledge of the Spirit in our hearts.

For Penitence, S. John 20. 23. Whosoever ye shall forgive, they are forgiven, &c. Acts 16. 18. And many of them that believed, came confessing their deeds.

For the Eucharist, S. Matt. 26. S. Mark 8. S. Luke 22. This is my body, &c. S. John 6. I am the living bread, I am the bread of life, he that eateth of this Bread, shall live for ever.

For extreme Unction, S. James 5. 14. If any be sick, let him bring in the Priests of the Church, and let them pray over him, anointing him with Oyl, in the name of our Lord, &c. And if he be in sins, they shall be remitted him. S. Mark 6. 13. And they anointed with Oyl many that were sick, and healed them.

For Holy Order, 2 Tim. 1. 6. I admonish thee, that thou resurrect the grace of God, which is in thee, by the imposition of my hands.

For Matrimony, Ephes. 5. 32. This Sacrament is great.

In all which places of Scripture we have manifestly the External Sign, either called a Sacrament,

ment, or to it annexed the forgiving of sins, or conferring of Life and Grace, which makes it a Sacrament of the New Law. So that there is no lurking here under ambiguity of words, as *Mr. Menck* will have it. However Hereticks vary in explaining Scripture, the Word of God doth not vary, nor his Church in understanding it.

3. As for the Fathers and Councils, See the Summary of Controversies, of the efficacy and number of Sacraments, where the places are marked, and the Manual of Controversie, Art. 28. where both Scripture and Fathers are cited at length. *Luther* himself de Captiv. Babil. granteth *S. Dennis* Disciple of *S. Paul* to stand for seven Sacraments. *S. Augustine* hath them all. Baptism in his 28. Epistle to *S. Hierom.* Confirmation in his second Book against *Prillian*. C. 104. Penance in his 2. Sermon upon the Ps. 101. Eucharist, in his 26. Treatise of *S. John*, and his Ep. 120. to *Honoratus*, where he calls it both a Sacrifice and a Sacrament. Extream Unction in his 5. Book of Baptism, C. 5. Holy Orders, in his 2. Book against *Parmen.* C. 13. Matrimony, in his Book of Faith and good Works, C. 7. And de bono Conjug. C. 24.

So that, when he speaks of two Sacraments of the Church, (*Gemina Ecclesia Sacramenta*) he understands there is two chief ones, to wit
Bap.

Baptism by reason of its necessity to salvation. And the Eucharist for its Excellency, and necessity both in his opinion. But to insist further on this here, is neither to the present purpose, or any part of what I did at first undertake. M. Menzeis running here and there, as in a Labyrinth, to shew the Fathers take not alwayes the word Sacrament in the strict and proper sense, doth only in this himself is inextricable difficulties, standing to his ground of Scripture clear in Fundamentals, which nowhere defines what properly a Sacrament is, or any where resolves and determinates what may be ambiguous and doubtful, either in it self, or the Fathers. How then shall we be assured of this without an Infallible Visible Judge? When some take even the clearest Scriptures and Writings of the Fathers in one sense, some in another. But the Catholick Church having received the Sacraments from Christ and his Apostles, and constantly Administred them in the sense, and for the ends they were Instituted, hath sufficiently declared both the Number and Nature of Sacraments, according to the Tradition of the Apostles, and constant practise of the same Church, which is an infallible Ground to us, whilst all Hereticks, with M. Menzeis are so intricate in the present Question, by the Diversity of Notions, they either find in Authours, or fancy

ay to themselves, (some admitting not only
 seven, says Mr. Menzeis, but seventeen Sa-
 craments, some, seven times seven, some se-
 ven, seven, yea, and more) that they lye
 still either in the Lurking Holes of Obscuri-
 ty and Ambiguity, the better to Palliate their
 Errors, or wander up and down in their un-
 fixed Belief, following their Fallible Con-
 jectures, uncertain Opinions, and Groundless
 Faith.

SECT. VI.

*Mr. Menzeis second Ground of
the Protestant Religion, Viz.
The Doctrine of the Church
in the first three Centuries, or
Ages, proved no Ground to
them, yea their very Ruine.*

AS Historiographers remark, the greatest Empires have begun to decay, how soon they left off to ground their greatness on new Conquests: And the Naturalists observe, that Trees, and Plants do presently fade, when their Roots do not spread as the Branches spring up: So the Protestant Religion should have instantly been chocked in its Rise, and as smothered in the Cradle; If Protestants standing constantly to their first Principle, had still rejected the Doctrine of the Church, under the specious pretence of adhering only to the pure and naked Word as a Ground most pure and clear,

clear, Scriptures making so clearly against them. Wherefore, though the first Reformers (as I shall presently shew) did disclaim the Doctrine of the Church in any Age after the Apostles, as infallible, or Ground of Faith, disclaim the Fathers, disclaim Miracles, disclaim a Succession from any: Yet others after the first heat of passion had a little relented, finding all this most disgraceful, and a most evident Conviction of their Errours, and fearing their Religions both fall and ruine, if not speedily propagated, claim a Succession, though from Old condemned Heresies, with M. Menzeis here, from the *Waldenses*, *Wickliffians*, *Hussites*, as we have seen: Cite the Fathers, though either to no purpose, or else corruptedly with *Du Plessis*, so evidently confuted by the Cardinal *Du Peron*, pretend to Miracles with M. *Pool* in his Nullity of the Romish Faith, though falsely, most Protestants disowning Miracles since the Apostles time, and all the world witnessing, it did never see a Miracle amongst them; yea they grant in fine, the diffusive body of the Church to be infallible in believing, but not the Representative, or Pastors even assembled in a General Council, Infallible in Teaching, with M. *Menzeis* again here: Who upon this gives us for a second Ground of the Protestant Religion; *The Doctrine of the Church in the first three Centuries of Ages.*

The sole reason he gives for the Churches Doctrine, as being a Ground of Faith at that time is, because, if the Catholick Religion was not then purely conserved in her, it was nowhere to be found (absit says he blasphemia) which without blasphemy cannot be thought. Whereupon I first reflect, that if it be blasphemy to deny, the Catholick Religion must always be purely conserved in some Church; many chief Protestants surely speak open blasphemy, who most boldly affirm before the Reformation made by Luther and Calvin, no Church to have conserved true Religion in its purity at all. Luther comment. in 1 Cor. 1. 13. I was the first to whom God vouchsafed to reveal these Doctrines which are now Preached; this praise they cannot take from us, that we were the first that brought light to the world: Without our help, no man had ever learned one word of the Gospel. This M. Wotton both acknowledgeth and confirmeth in Exam. Jur. Rom. Luther might well say he was the first, a Son without a Father, a Schollar without a Master, &c.

Calvin in an Epistle of his to Melancthon, It doth not a little concern us (sayes he) that not the least suspicion of any Discord risen amongst us descends to Posterity, for it were a thing more then absurd, after we have been constrained to make separation from the whole world, if we in our beginning should also divide from one another.

Chillingworth, Ch. 5. Sect. 55. as for the Ex-
ter-

ternal Communion of the visible Church; we have without Scruple formerly granted; that Protestants did forsake it.

Bucer. p. 660. All the world erred (he speaks before the Reformation) in that Article of the Real Presence.

Bibliander, in orat. ad princip. Germ. c. 72. it is without all question, that from the time of Gregory the great, the Pope is the Antichrist, who with his abomination hath made drunk all Kings and people from the highest to the lowest.

Brochard, on the second Ch. Rev. p. 4. when the first assault was made upon the Papacy by Luther, the knowledge of Christ was wanting in all and every one of his members.

White, in his defence, C. 37. Pa. 136. Popery was a Leprosie breeding so universally in the Church, that there was no visible company of men, appearing in the world, free from it.

Bennet Morgentern, in his Treatise of the Church, calls it ridiculous, to say any before Luther had the purity of the Gospel.

Simon Voyon, Cat. Doct. in his Epistle to the Reader, says, when Pope Boniface was installed, then was that universal Apostacy from the Faith, which was foretold by Paul.

M. Jewel upon the Revelation fol. 110. The truth was then unheard of, when Luther and Zwingli came to preach the Gospel.

Febastian Francus, in his Epistle of abrogating
Eccle-

Ecclesiastical Statutes, says, for certain, through the work of the Antichrist, the External Church, together with the faith and Sacraments vanished away presently after the Apostles departure, and for these thousand and four hundred years, the Church hath been no where External and Visible.

From all which Testimonies of most renowned Protestants, yea, and of the very first Reformers is evidently proved: First, that they did not think any visible Church to have conserved at all times, the purity of the Gospel, which M. *Menzies* calls blasphemy to deny. Secondly, that they claim not a Succession from any that went before them (except only from the Apostles) what ever later Protestants do falsely pretend. Thirdly, that they own no more the diffusive body of the Church infallible then the Representative, seeing no Church professing the Doctrine they did teach, is acknowledged by them for many hundred years before the Reformation. Fourthly, That Popery was the only Religion generally prevailing, and openly professed, for no less time then fourteen hundred years before *Luther*. Fifthly, how well M. *Menzies* agreeth with other Protestants in this his second Ground of Faith.

You shall presently, God willing, hear both greater and better witnesses deposing against him; but first I ask what peculiar reason he has, why the Church in her childhood, and younger age,

K

should

should be a ground of Faith, and not afterwards, and in her full maturity? as we grant her, the fulness of Divine Wisdom even from her birth, which did not increase by age, so by age it cannot decay. We shall now presently see, how like the Protestant Church is to that of the three first Centuries; but before this, I would know, why *M. Menzeis* gives her Doctrine rather for a ground, then in following times? Is there any peculiar promise made to her, any particular reason militates for her, or any testimonies of the Scriptures, or Fathers given to her in one time, rather then in another? was her Doctrine then purer? her Condition more flourishing, her authority greater? Doth not *M. Menzeis* grounding his Faith upon the Doctrine of the Church in any age after the Apostles, confirm that Romish Tenet of the Church Doctrine as a Ground in other Ages, by parity of reason?

Secondly, I reflect that *M. Menzeis*, who will admit of no Infallible Visible Judge of Controversie, of no Infallible Tradition not contained in Scripture, nor of any Assembly of the Fathers, and Pastor of the Church in a General Council as infallible in their Decrees: Here either acknowledgeth the Records of the Ecclesiastick History, and Writings of the Fathers, as witnessing infallibly to us, the Doctrine of these ages, or else must grant he hath no infallible

lible assurance that this his second ground of Faith is solid and Infallible. There being no other way left us (without particular Revelation) to know what Doctrine the Church did teach, and Believe in the first three Ages, save only the Writings of the Fathers, and Tradition of the present Church; which consequently M. Menzeis must either here own as Infallible; or avouch he builds his Faith upon a sandy and fallible ground.

The first Reformers standing better to their own Principles than he, and of much greater sincerity and learning, grant plainly the Fathers of the Primitive Church, to hold many things in opposition to them.

Luther *L. de seruo arbitr. C. 2.* and in his *Table Conferences C. de patrib. Eccl.* The Authority of the Fathers is not to be regarded; in the Writings of Hierome, there is not a word of true Faith in Christ, & sound Religion: Tertullian is very Superstitious: I have holden Origen long since accused: of Chrysostome, I make no account: Basil is of no worth; he is wholly a Monk, I weigh not him a hair; Cyprian is a weak Divine, affirming there yet further, that the Apology of Melancthon doth far excell all the Doctors of the Church, yea even Augustine himself. Calvin *L. 3. Inst. C. 3.* It was a custome 1300. years ago (that is in the second age) to pray for the dead, but all of that time,

(says he) *I confess were carried away with Error.*

And in the fourth Book of his Institutions, Chapter 9. he will stand to no Decision of Councils, Fathers, Bishops, but try all by Scripture alone; granting generally all the *Western Churches* to have defended Popery, Resp. ad Versipell. p. 134.

Obscured Melancthon on the first Cor. 3. speaks plain, presently from the beginning of the Church, the ancient Fathers, ~~observed~~ the Doctrine of Justice by Faith, increased Ceremonies, and devised new *Worships*.

In like manner, Peter Martyr 1. *devotus* p. 477. that in the Church, Errors did begin, Immediately after the Apostles; and therefore as long as we stand to Councils and Fathers, we shall be always in the same Errors.

Whitaker cont. 2. q. 5. C. 7. it is true which Calvin and the Centurists have written, that the ancient Church did Err in many things, as touching Limbo, free Will, merit of Works, &c.

Chemnitius in Exam. conc. trid. pa. 200. most of the Fathers did not dispute, but avouch, that the souls of Martyrs heard the petitions of those who prayed to them, they went to the Monuments of Martyrs, and Invoked Martyrs by name.

D. Fulk in his confutation of Purgatory, grants Tertullian, Cyprian, Hierome, Augustine do witness, that Sacrifice for the Dead is a Tradition of the

the Apostles; yea in his retentive, says, Prayer for the dead prevailed within the first 300. years. And in his Answer to a counterfeit Catholick, That Pope Victor in the second Age, did practise Supremacy in the Church.

The Centurists do reprehend Cyprian, Origen, Tertullian in the third Century; and S. Gregory Nazianzen in the fourth, for teaching Peters Primacy; as they do also S. Cyprian in the third Century, of Superstition for saying, that the Priest (at Mass) holds the place of Christ, and offers up Sacrifice to God the Father. *Sacerdotem Cyprianus inquit, vice Christi fungi & deo patri sacrificium offerre.* And generally confess, the Fathers of the third Age do witness, and that not in obscure terms invocation of Saints; videas, in doctorum hujus sæculi Scriptis non obscura vestigia invocationis Sanctorum. They say further in the second Century, S. Irenæus admitteth free Will, even in Spiritual actions, and that S. Clement every where asserteth it, so that the Doctors and Pastors of that Age, were in this manner of blindness, say they, reckoning out in this number, S. Cyprian, Theophilus, Tertullian, Origen, Clemens Alexandrinus, Justine, Irenæus, Athenagoras, Tatianus, &c. As doth also Abraham Scultetus with them. Yea Doctor Humphrey in his Jesuitisms, pa. 2. and else where Eccl. C. 15. says, it cannot be denyed, but that S. Irenæus, S. Clement, and other Fathers of the first and second age called Apostolicks (for that they

were Disciples of the Apostles, or immediately followed them) have in their Writings the Opinion of free Will, and Merit of Works; The Century Writers, and Scultetus Tax for the same Clement of Alexandria, S. Cyprian, Justin Martyr, &c. In the third Century, they say, Origen made good Works, the cause of Justification, and in the 5. Accuse, S. Chrysostome for handling the Doctrine of Justification impurely, as attributing Merit to Works.

M. Whitaker saith, that not only Cyprian, but almost all the most holy Fathers of that time were in that Errour, as thinking so to pay the pain due to sin, and to satisfy to Gods Justice, in so far as Luther on the 4. ch. to the Gallathians calls for this, Hierome, Ambrose, Augustine, and other Fathers Justice-workers of the old Papacy. And M. Wotton in his defence of M. Perkins, forbeareth not to censure, for this very Point of Merit, the undoubted and confessed Writings of Ignatius, Disciple of S. John.

Chemnitius in his Examine, par. 4. p. 20. affirmeth the Antient Fathers Erred in making Pilgrimages to Relicks of Saints, and Osiander with the Centurists, Cent. 4. that S. Hierome did foolishly contend, that the Relicks of Saints ought to be worshipped.

For owning Traditions, Chemnitius in his Exam. Par. 1. p. 87. 89. 90. reproves Clement of Alexandria, Origen, Epiphanius, Hierome, Ambrose, Basil,

Basil, Maximus, Damascene, and M. Whitaker, de Sacra Script. S. Chrysostome as speaking inconsiderately when he admitteth them. D. Reynolds in his Concla. 1. p. 689. somewhat more moderate, leaves the censuring of S. Epiphanius, for this to the Church.

M. Whitgift in his defence against Cartwrights Reply, grants Ignatius Disciple of the Apostles, to have said of Hereticks, They do not admit the Eucharist to be the flesh of our Saviour Jesus Christ, which flesh suffered for our sins. And M. Beacon in his Treatise, the Relicks of Rome, says the Mass was begotten, conceived, and born anon after the Apostles time, if it be true, what Historiographers write.

Calvin L. 1. Inst. C. 4. confesseth in the Primitive Church, Confession, Pennance, and Absolution by the Priests: and the Century Writers, that in the times of S. Cyprian and Tertulian, there was used private confession, even of thoughts, and lesser sins, then so commanded as necessary. Where any judicious Reader may evidently see, how by chief Protestant Authours, both the Primitive Church, and the Fathers are censured for many Errours. Yea and for the very same, which are most objected against the Romish Church, a most invincible Argument from the confession of our Adversaries; That the Church and Fathers of the three first Ages, did teach the self same Doctrine with the pre-

sent Roman Church, and with Pope *Pius* in his confession of Faith in all those Points quoted by them, Free Will, Merit of Works, Invocation of Saints, honouring of Relicks, Prayer and Sacrifice for the Dead, *S. Peters* Primacy amongst the Apostles, the Popes Supremacy in the Church, Mass, Traditions, the Real Presence, Confession, Penance, Absolution, &c. So that if *M. Menzeis* will stand to his own word, and trust the Writings of his brethren, He is here again engaged to turn Papist.

Many more such Quotations could I produce from chief Protestant Writers, acknowledging both the Church and Fathers, of the first three Ages, holding most controverted Tenets, flatly against Protestants. And yet so confident *M. Menzeis* is, he dare take the Church Doctrine at that time, for a Ground of the Protestant Religion, and this no doubt to shew the deepness of his Learning, and how well he is versed in Antiquity, till presently we hear the Fathers themselves speaking, the better to make both his Weakness and Ignorance appear.

But before I enter upon this, I remark *M. Menzeis* in his 8. paper, says, we agree with Protestants in all their Positive Tenets, and only in their Negatives disagree. How true this is, I do not now dispute, yet must here reflect, that all chief Heresies, for the most part, with that of Protestants have ever consisted in Negations,
and

and in denying some Points of Faith, generally received in the Church. *Sabellius* danged three persons in the God-head, *Erictes* two Natures in Christ, *Nestorius* in Christ one Person: The *Monothelites* two wills in Christ, as two Natures: The *Arians*, Christ to be consubstantial with his Father: The *Macedonians*, the consubstantiality of the Holy Ghost: *Marcion*, that Baptism in the Church should be conferred but once, The *Novatians*, that sinners after Baptism could be absolved upon Repentances, and even such Heresies Protestants most claim to, as the *Grecians* deny the Procession of the Holy Ghost from the Father and the Son, the *Waldenses* deny Princes and Magistrates to conserve their Dignities and Power when fallen in mortal sin: The *Hussites* deny that the predestinate could sin, the *Albigenses*, Marriages to be lawful, the *Wickliffians*, Free Will, and so forth. *Negatio est Malignantis natura*, say the Philosophers, Negations are of a Malignant Nature, whence we see, that as Atheism consists in denying God, so Heresies are most in Negations, as flowing from the Spirit of Pride, contradiction, Rebellion.

However it is time we shew what conformity there is betwixt Protestants Negative Tenets, and the Doctrine of the Church in the first three Centuries, or Ages; M. Menzeis provoking so confidently his Adversary to bring any Essential

trial difference from the Authentick writings of
 these Fathers, and upon this engaging to turn Pa-
 pist. I do not here question further then I have done
 in my second reflection, how he who admits of
 no Infallible Visible Judge, can be sufficiently
 assured of their Authentick Writings, for if
 he take this only upon their conformity with
 Scripture, they can make no peculiar Ground to
 him, rather then other mens Writings, having
 the like conformity with it, or can they be cal-
 ed properly a distinct Ground from it, But ha-
 ving seen how many chief Protestants disown
 the most antient Fathers, challenge them of ma-
 nyfold Errours, censure their Doctrine (a
 most strong conviction against M. Menzeis, that
 they take not their Writings for a Ground) let
 us hear themselves deposing clearly in our fa-
 vour against him, and see if they who have
 confounded so many Atheists, convinced so ma-
 ny Infidels, converted so many Hereticks, may
 even happily prevail with M. Fahn. I cite here
 only the Fathers in the first three Centuries af-
 ter Christ, as M. Menzeis makes only his ap-
 peal to them in which Ages, the Church being
 still under persecution, had not indeed so ma-
 ny Writers as in following times, to witness
 her Doctrine against all Hereticks: Yet you
 shall God willing see how clearly the chiefest
 of them dissent from Protestants in all contro-
 versies, and you shall see how many have been converted

verted Tenets, and most disgracefully belie him.

*The Fathers of the first three ages
clearly speaking against Prote-
stants in all Chief Controverted
Tenets.*

I Begin even at what is most Principal, to wit, the Popes Supremacy, this Protestants deny. But in the first Age, S. Denis de divinis nominibus, C. 3. calls S. Peter first Bishop of Rome, the Supreme and most antient top of Divines. Where both Primacy and Supremacy is given to him. S. Clement Disciple of S. Peter in his first Epistle, declares him both the ground stone of the Church, and the most powerful of the Apostles.

S. Ignatius Disciple of S. John, in his Epistle to the Romans, extolling their Church, calls her, *The Church that presides at Rome.*

In the second Age, S. Irenaeus l. 3. contra Valent. C. 3. says, *the Romish Church is the greatest and*

and most antient: And again, *l. 3. C. 3.* all Churches round about ought to resort to the Roman Church, by reason of her more powerful Principality.

In the third Age, *Zepherinus* Pope, in his Epistle to the Bishops of Sicily decreed, That the greater causes of the Church, were to be determined by the Apostolick See, because so the Apostles and their Successors had ordained.

In the third Age, *Origen* on the 6. Ch. to the *Rom.* says, The chief charge of feeding Christs Sheep was given to S. Peter, and the Church founded upon him.

In the same Age, S. *Cyprian* Ep. ad Jul. We hold Peter the Head and Root of the Church; and again, Ep. 55. he calls the Church of Rome S. Peters Chair. Yea in the second Century, *Amandus Polonus*, M. *Spark*, and M. *Whitaker*, (though Protestants) confess, that *Victor* then Bishop of Rome, (whom M. *Whitgift* calls a godly Bishop) carried himself as Pope, or Head of the Church.

So well has Protestant Doctrine in this Point, a Ground in the Fathers of the first three Ages; that *Danaus* a Protestant, in his Answer to *Bel-larmine*, acknowledgeth Sovereign Authority to have been practised by the Popes of the third Age, the Centurists, Cent. 3. that *Tertullian* did think the keys to be committed chiefly to S. Peter, and the Church to be built on him; and S. *Cyprian* to have taught, that the Roman Church ought to be acknowledged of all others, the Mother Church.

Now

Now shall all this be called Protestant Doctrine; that S. Peter was Head and Root of the Church; that the Church was founded upon him, that the chief charge of Christs Flock was given to him, that he is the Supreme amongst Divines; that the Church of Rome is his Chair, which for this hath a more powerful Principality, as greatest, so that the greater causes in the Church ought to be decided by her? where by parts, all the Controversie of the Popes Supremacy is holden out against them.

Secondly, Protestants deny we should believe any thing not contained in Scripture, upon Apostolical Tradition conserved in the Church.

But in the first age, S. Denis, *Ecc. Hierarch. C. 1.* speaking of the Apostles, says, *These our first Captains of Priestly Function, did deliver to us the chiefeft and most Substantial Points, partly in written, partly unwritten Institutions.*

In the same Age, S. Ignatius, *apud Euseb. l. 3. Hist. C. 36.* doth exhort all to stick to the Traditions of the Apostles.

In the second Age, S. Irenaus, *L. 3. C. 4.* what if the Apostles had left no Scriptures at all, ought we not to follow the Order of Tradition, which they have delivered unto those, to whom they did commit their Churches? and to which assent many Barbarous Nations who believe in Christ without Character or Ink.

On the same Age, Origen Hom. 5. in lib. vum. there are many things in Ecclesiastical Traditions which all ought to do, and on the 6. Ch. to the Romans, he sayes, to baptize Infants is one.

In the third Age, Tertullian de præscr. teacheth Hereticks are to be confuted rather by Tradition than Scriptura; and L. de Cor. mil. speaking of the Ceremonies of Baptism, the sign of the Cross, Sacrifice for the Dead, &c. he addeth, of these, and such like things, if thou require a ground in Scriptura, thou shalt find none: Tradition did begin them, Custome has confirmed their Practice, and Faith doth observe them.

In the same Age, Cyprian l. 1. Ep. 12. says, he that is Baptized, ought to be anointed, but of this Unction, there is no mention in Scripture; and in his second B. Ep. 3. he admonisheth Water should be mixed with Wine in the Chalice at Mass, upon a like Tradition from the Apostles. See in what I have cited heretofore, how the Fathers have received the Scriptures upon Tradition, and many most substantial Points with it, and upon due consideration of all this, let any one judge, whether the Fathers of the first three Ages, in these their most Authentick Writings I know, do make a ground for Protestant or Catholick Doctrine, speaking so plainly, the chiefest & most Substantial Points of our Faith, were delivered partly in Written; and partly in Unwritten Institutions, exhorting us to stick to Traditions

conferred in the Church, which serve for ^{the} conversion of Infidels, conviction of Hereticks, and generally ought to be kept by all.

3. Protestants deny the unbloody Sacrifice of Christs body and blood offered up to God in the Mass.

Yet in the first Age, the very Liturgies of the Apostles are extant, and in that of S. James, we offer unto thee (O Lord) the unbloody Sacrifice for our sins. And S. Andrew in the Book of his Passion, written by his Disciples, says unto the Tyrant. I sacrifice daily the Immaculate Lamb to Almighty God.

And in the same Age, S. Clement, Bishop of Rome, writes, It is not lawful to celebrate Masses in other places, but in these wherein the proper Bishop shall appoint, and these things the Apostles received from our Lord and delivered to you.

S. Ignatius, Bishop of Smyrna, writes, It is not lawful without a Bishop to offer, or Sacrifice, or Celebrate Mass.

In the second Age, S. Irenaeus, Bishop of Lyons, calls the Body and Blood of Christ, the Oblation of the New Testament, which the Church having received from the Apostles, offereth to God through the whole world.

And Tertullian, l. de Veland. virg. it is not permitted that women should teach, or speak in the Church, nor Baptize, nor Offer. Origen hom. 14. in Exod. you think your selves guilty, and unworthy

thy

thy if any part of the Consecrated Host be lost through your negligence.

S. Hippolitus, Orat. de Antichr. bringeth in Christ speaking thus, Come you Bishops and Priests, who have daily offered my precious Body and Blood. How clear are the following Fathers, S. Epiphanius, S. Chrysostome, S. Athanasius, S. Basil, &c. with S. Augustine for this? as even in the third Age, S. Cyprian Serm. de carna. dom. the Eucharist is a Holocaust to purge our sins, and in his Epistle, ad Cyrill. he calls it a Sacrifice seven times.

4. Protestants deny the Real Presence, and Transubstantiation.

But in the first age, S. Ignatius in his Epistle ad Smyrnenes (often cited by Eusebius, Athanasius, S. Jerome, Theodoret and other antients) speaking of the Saturnian Hereticks, says, They admit not of Eucharists and Oblations, because they do not confess the Eucharist to be our Saviours flesh, which suffered for our sins; and in his Epistle to the Romans, I do not delight in any corruptible food, nor in the pleasures of this life, I desire the bread of God, the heavenly bread, which is the flesh of Christ the Son of God.

S. Denis Areop. l. de Eccl. Hierarch. C. 3. O most Divine and holy Sacrament, vouchsafe mercifully to open the Veils of those signifying Signs, wherein thou hidest thy self, and appear plainly unto us.

In the second Age, *S. Irenaeus*, l. 4. c. 34. disputing against the Hereticks, who denyed Christ to be the Son of God, asks how it shall be manifested unto them, that bread upon which thanks are given, is the body of our Lord, and the Chalice, his Blood, if they say he is not the Son of the Maker of the world.

S. Cyprian *serm. de cana dom.* The Bread which our Lord gave to his Disciples, being changed not in shape, but in nature by the Omnipotency of the word is made flesh.

In the third Age, *Origen*, We eat the bread offered by Prayer, made a certain holy Body. And again, *hom. 3. in div. loca Evang.* When thou receivest the holy Food, thou Eatest and Drinkst the Body and Blood of our Lord, then the Lord entereth under thy roof, &c.

In the same Age, *Tertullian* l. 4. contra *Marcion*. c. 40. The Bread taken and distributed to his Disciples he made his body. What can be said more clearly then all this, either for the Real Presence, or Transubstantiation, which is nothing but the change of the Bread in Christs Body, here so plainly asserted.

Add to this, for communion under one kind, denyed by Protestants, it is said to have been so given to Infants, by *S. Denis* l. *Eccl. Hierach.* c. ult. to both Infants and sick, by *S. Cyprian*, *serm. de lapsis* n. 20. and by *Tertullian* l. *ad uxorem*, to have been carried to private houses, *gen* and over

See by Eusebius l. 5. best. which could not be done, but under one kind.

5. Protestants deny purgatory and prayers for the dead. But in the first Age, S. Denis Eccl. Hierarch. part. 3. C. 7. says the Venerable Prelate approaching powereth forth his holy Prayer upon the dead, by that Prayer he doth beseech the Divine clemency to forgive all the sins of the dead committed through humane Infirmities, and to place him in light, and in the Region of the living.

In the same Age, S. Clement l. 8. Const. C. 48. has a long Prayer accustomed to be said for the dead. Again the same S. Clem. Ep. 1. de S. Petro tells us, S. Peter taught them among other works of mercy, to pray and give alms for the dead. And in the Liturgy of S. James Apostle, we have Prayers also for them.

Tertullian l. de Corona militis, numb'reth prayer for the dead amongst the Traditions of the Apostles, and speaks thus, l. de anima C. 58. Seeing we understand that prison which the Gospel demonstrates to be places below, and the last farthing, we interpret every small fault there to be punished, by the delay of the Resurrection, no man will doubt but that the soul doth recompence something in the places below, Ibid. we make yearly Oblations, says he, for the dead. Origen hom. 6. in Exod. he that is saved, is saved by fire, so that if a man have something mixed with Lead, that the fire doth purge and resolve, that all may become pure Gold.

S. Cy.

S. Cyprian, l. 4. Ep. 2. It is one thing to be purged a long time for sins by Torment, and cleansed by a long fire, and another thing to purge all sins by patience and sufferings. What fire is more clear then S. Augustine and others be with S. Cyprian and Origen here for a purging fire? I know Protestants Expound that place of S. Paul, 1 Cor. 3. v. 13, 14. of the fire of Tribulation in this life, but not so, S. Augustine in Ps. 37. where citing the words of the Apostle, he shall be safe, yet so as by fire, says, and because it is said, he shall be safe, that fire is conterned; yet that fire shall be more grievous then what ever a man can suffer in this life; and then entring in a most fervent Prayer continues, Purge me, O Lord, in this life, that I need not that mending fire.

6. Protestants deny Invocation and honouring of Saints. But in the first Age, *S. Denis eccl. Hierarch. C. 7. says, I constantly affirm with the Divine Scripture, that the Prayers of the Saints are very profitable for us in this life, when a man is inflamed with a desire to imitate the Saints, and distrust his own weakness, he betakes himself to any Saint, beseeching him to be his helper and petitioner to God for him, he shall obtain by that means very great assistance.*

In the same Age *S. Clement l. Apost. Constit. 5. We command you, that the Martyrs be in all honor among you, even as James the Bishop, and Stephen our fellow Deacon have been amongst us, for God*

has made them blessed, and holy men have honoured them. In the second Age, S. Cornelius Ep. 1. exhorteith to beseech God and our Lord Jesus Christ, that his holy Apostles making Intercession for you, he would purge you from your sins.

And Justin Martyr Apol. 2. We worship and adore both God the Father and his Son, &c. as also the company of his followers, and the good Angels, and we worship them both by words and deeds, and in truth even as we our selves have been taught and instructed.

In the third Age S. Cyprian l. 4. Ep. 9. The sufferings and days of Martyrs we celebrate with a yearly remembrance.

And Origen in Lament. I will begin to fall down on my knees, and pray to all his Saints to succour me, who dare not ask God, for the exceeding greatness of my sins. O Saints of my God, with tears I beseech you to fall down before his mercy for me a wretch.

7. Protestants deny the use of the sign of the Cross, and Images.

But in the first Age, S. Denis l. 2. Eccl. Hierarch. c. 2. The sign of the Cross is so much honoured, that it is often used both in baptism and other Sacraments.

In the same Age, S. Martial Ep. ad Burdegala. Remember the Cross of our Lord, keep it in your mind, speak often of it, have it in the Sign, for it is your invincible Armour against Satan. Tertullian l. de

Coron.

Coron. milit. c. 3. In every thing we do, we sign our forehead with the sign of the Cross, of which practice, Tradition is the defender, Custom the conservor, and Faith the observer. And in his time he sayes l. 2. *de pudicit.* The Image of Christ bearing a Lamb, was graven on the Chalice used in Churches; And how famous is the memory of many more Images in the first three Ages, as that of our Saviour sent to *Abgarus* Prince of *Edessa*, of which see *Evagrius* l. 4. c. 26. *Metaphrastes*, in the life of *Constantine*, *S. John Damascen* in his book of Images. That which the woman cured of a Flux set up in brass at *Cesarea Philippi*, as witness *Eusebius* in his 7. Book Ch. 14. So *Zozimus* l. 5. c. 20. and *Damascene* again, *Ibid.* a third made by *Nicodemus*, which being afterward taken by the Jews, and in mockery crucified, was honored by God with many Miracles, as is related by *S. Athanasius*, or some other most antient Author of the Book Intituled, of the Passion of our Lords Image. Besides these, *Theodorus Lect.* l. 1. *Colletan.* maketh mention of one of our blessed Lady, drawn by *S. Luke*. *Eusebius* relateth, that he did see many antient Images of Christ placed betwixt *S. Peter* and *S. Paul*, as much witnesseth *S. Augustine* l. 1. *De conf. Evan.* c. 10. *Damascus* in the life of *S. Silvester*, writeth that *Constantine* in the place where he was Baptized, Erected Silver Images of our Saviour and *S. John Baptist*, as also others in the Church of *S. John*

Lateran, which the first Christian Emperour had never done, nor S. Silvester permitted, if the practice of the Church from the Apostles had not been such.

8. Protestants deny Free will, after the fall of Adam, but in the first Age, S. Clement l. 3. recognis. Asketh how doth God judge every man by his deeds according to truth; if he have not in his power to do what is commanded, if this be held, all things are frustrate, in vain shall the study be of following better things; In the same Age S. Ignatius Ep. ad Magn. If any man do wickedly, he is a man of the Devil, not made so by Nature, but by his own free will.

In the second Age, S. Justin Martyr in Apol. Unless mankind can both fly foul and undecent things, and follow fair and good things of his own free will; it is without all cause and blame of theirs, howsoever things be done.

S. Irenaeus l. 4. c. 72. not only in words, but even in Faith hath Almighty God reserved liberty of will to Man, saying, be it to thee according to thy Faith.

In the third Age, S. Cyprian in Deut. & l. 3. ad Quirin. c. 52. The freedome of believing or not believing, is placed in the will.

In the same Age Origen hom. 12. in Num. O Israel, what doth thy Lord God require of thee? let them be ashamed of these words, who deny free will in man; how should God require of man, unless
man

man had in his power, what to offer to God requiring.

9. Protestants deny merit of Works.

But in the first Age, S. Ignatius Ep. ad Rom. says, Give me leave to become the food of beasts, that by that means I might merit and win God. In the second, Justin Martyr, Apol. 2. We think that men who by works have shewed themselves worthy, &c. shall by their Merits live and Reign with him.

In the third, S. Cyprian l. de Unit. eccl. We must obey his Precepts and Admonitions, that our Merits may receive their reward.

And in his Serm. de Eleem. If the day of our return shall find us unloadned, swift, and running in the way of good works, our Lord will not fail to reward our merits.

10. Protestants deny the possibility of keeping the Commandements, which S. Basil. orat. in illud attende tibi, calls a wicked thing to say. S. Hierome on the 5. of S. Matthew, Blasphemy: S. Augustine, serm. 61. de tempore, a denial both of the justice and holiness of God.

In the the third Age, Tertullian as cited by the Centurists, Cent. 3. says, No Law could tye him, who had not in his power due obedience to the Law. This is a maxime in Philosophy, wherefore Origen hom. 9. in Jos. sayes plainly, the baptized may fulfil the Law in all things.

Now not to be more tedious or prolix in ei-

ing either Passages or Fathers (whose Quotations could easily make a just Volume) of the Sacraments I have spoken in the former Section; and of the Pastors of the Church, their infallible Authority in a general Council, in the third: which with what is here said, are the main things and most substantial denyed by Protestants, but clearly asserted by the Fathers cited, who all confessedly did live in the first three ages, a very few excepted; I have brought, of the fourth and fifth age, only as witnesses of what was practised in the Church before their time; leaving the Canons of the Apostles, and many things by Tradition from them conserved in the Church, and witnessed by the Fathers, with the Decrees of most holy Popes and Martyrs of the first and second Age, as these of *Anacletus*, *Alexander*, *Sixtus*, *Telesphorus*, *Pius*, *Anicetus*, *Soter*, &c. holding out so many of our Tenets against Protestants: and this to shun Cavils and Exceptions, which they might take either at their writings or place, as they do. As for the same cause many other most renowned Authors, as *Polycarpus*, *Cornelius*, *Proberus*, *Methodius*, *Nilus*, *Agapeus*, *Dorotheus* and others, upon this only account, with the Book of *Hermes* (of whom *S. Paul* to the *Romans*, *Ch. 16.* maketh mention) called the Pastor, which *Hamelmanus* and *M. Hooker* both Protestants, grant to have been reckoned by the ancient Fathers in the number

ber of Ecclesiastical Books, and particularly as seemeth to *Hamelmanus* by no less men then *Irenaeus*, *Clement*, and *Origen*. Yet this Book in such esteem with them, he will have to be impure, as laying the ground of Purgatory, Prayer for the dead, Merit and Justification of Works, of professed Chastity in Priests and Church-men, of fasting from certain Meats at times, &c. But I hope M. *Menzeis* will make no exception against most Authors I have produced, unless passing from his appeal to the Fathers of the first three ages; he pass also from his second ground of Faith, as certainly after all has been said he should do, seeing I may justly speak home to him here, with *S. Augustine* in his 11. Book against *Julian*, the *Pelagian Heretick*, c. 10. *What the Catholick Fathers and Doctors have found in the Church, that they hold: what they have received from their forefathers, that they have delivered to their children. Whilest we had no debate as yet with you before them as Judges, our case was pleaded amongst them; we were not as yet contesting with you, and nevertheless by their decree we have the victory over you. Neither is this victory imaginary (as that of M. Menzeis) but real; as the three Arguments I have brought make good; which by way of recapitulation, I set before him in this one Argument: the Doctrine of the Church, and writings of the Fathers in the first three Ages, can be no ground to Protestants*

stants for what they teach: First, if the chief Reformers disown them. Secondly, if most learned Protestants accuse them of many Errours. Thirdly, If their own Writings in all controverted Tenets be flatly against Protestant Doctrine: but all this is true from the places produced; then their Writings can be no ground to them. Yet Protestants will needs make up their Religion from the Writings of the Fathers, as some Poets from the Centons and broken Verses of *Virgil* and *Homer*, the life of Christ. They challenge the Fathers for their Heresie upon a word or two picked out of places wherein they have an Orthodox sense: In so many hundred Volumes of the Fathers writings, that some word or passages seem to favour Heresie, what wonder? Gods own Word, if we will stick to the naked Letter, seeming to favour so many, as we have seen above. They oppose Fathers to Fathers, and sometimes one to himself, so they are possessed with the Spirit of contradiction, that all may turn Problematick, and be controverted among them. They cite the Scriptures against the Fathers, as if their new and giddy headed start-ups, did better understand them, then the most antient and solid Divines; they will at times, by passages of the Fathers or Scripture, strive to condemn the practice of the Church, and Decrees of Councils: but who ever amongst the Fathers did so? doth any one

of the Fathers (with the first Reformers) oppose Scripture as understood by them) to the Authority of the Church, or to the same Scripture, as explained by her? Doth any of them attach the Roman Church of Errour? To say such a Church, so great and glorious in the Christian world, did Apostatize, and none did remark her Apostacy; is like a general Eclipse of the Sun, remarked by none. The least Errours of particular Hereticks, the Fathers have so narrowly sifted, so sharply censured, so solidly confuted: and shall we think, they have either not spied, or spared to censure the corruptions of a whole body and Church. But let wise men and greatest Shcollars be at variance as they please, about some places both of Scriptures and Fathers, as surely it will be to the Worlds end; God hath given us both a sure and short way, promised by the Prophet, wherein even ignorants and fools cannot err, Christ having left us the present Catholick Church in all ages, as the most faithful Depositary of his Doctrine, and the Infallible Visible Judge of all that can be controverted in matters of Faith.

Before I end this Section, to give you but a scantling with what sincerity and candor Hereticks cite the Fathers; this I borrow from *Mi Menzeis* in his third paper, where in general, he most confidently says, *That whatever the antient Apologists, as Justin Martyr, Tertullian, and A-*
the-

thenagoras have said for the Christian Religion; the same Protestants may say for their own. Whereupon having diligently read over the first of these Apologies, which is that of *Justin Martyr* (as any may do in an hour) I have found him so grossly mistaken in citing this Father, that I may justly say, he could not more forfeit his reputation. This I evidence in four chief Points asserted by us, and denied by Protestants.

The first is Free Will, for which *Justin* in his Apology is so clear, that having said, *If men had not in their Free Will, to fly what is filthy, and choose what is honest, they should be no wise to blame for what ever action; he will have it a Demonstration; That men have freedom to live virtuously, or fall in sin, because we see them by experience to pass from one of these contraries to the other.* His words are, *ac nisi libero arbitrio & ad turpia fugienda, & ad honesta deligenda facultatem habeat mortalium genus, non fuerit in causa, siue culpa quatuordecimque denum, factorum: Sed enim libero id delectu tum recte per virtutem vivere, cum per peccatum labi, ad hunc demonstramus modum: hominem eundem ad contraria subinde transire videmus.*

The second is Merit of Works, in acknowledging a reward to them, his words again are, *Atque hoc etiam si paucis persuaferimus, maximum tamen inde feremus lucrum; nam ut boni agricola amplam & domino capiemus mercedem.*

The

The third is the efficacy of Baptism, in cleansing us by water from all former sins, and making us the children of God, *ut ne necessitate & ignorantia liberi permaneamus, sed delectus & scientia filii facimus, ac remissionem ante commissorum peccatorum consequamur in aqua.*

The fourth the Real Presence, saying of the Consecrated Bread and Wine in so express words; *Not as common Meat and common Drink do we take these things, but even as by the Word of God, our Saviour JESUS Incarnate had flesh and blood for our Salvation, so we are taught that the Eucharist is the flesh and blood of the self same JESUS Incarnate.* His words are; *Non enim ut communem panem neque communem potum ista sumimus, sed quemadmodum per verbum dei, caro factus Jesus Christus Servator noster, carnem & sanguinem habuit: ad eundem modum, etiam eam in qua per preces verbi ejus ab ipso profecti gratia sumus acta, alimoniam, incarnati illius Jesu carnem & sanguinem esse edocti sumus. Nam Apostoli in commentariis à se scriptis, qua Evangelia vocantur ita tradiderunt.*

Diverse other things in the same Apology I pass, these few things being sufficient, to shew M. Menzeis ingenuity, and how he with other Hereticks dare cite the Fathers, who even most evidently and expressly condemn them.

But to close this Section (which citations have

have made longer then I intended) with one Query I ask M. Menzeis where he shall find , so much as in one of the Fathers, any point of Doctrine taught by the present Roman Church condemned of Heresie : as many Protestant Tenets they hold against us, are declared Heretical by so many, as by S. Ireneus l. 1. c. 20. to say with Simon Magus, that men are not saved by good works; by S. Epiphanius hæres. 8. to say with Cerinthus, That children may be saved without Baptism. By the same S. Epiphanius, to say with the Ptolemaists, That God has commanded some impossible things. By S. Augustine, l. 20. contr. Faust. to pull down Altars with the Manichees. By the same S. Augustine l. 2. Contra lit. Petil. C. 32. and 34. To say with the Donatists, That the Baptism of Christ, and that of S. John Baptist were all one : by S. Epiphanius hæres. 75. and S. Augustine hæres. 53. To say with the Arians, that Fasts of the Church are not to be observed, nor Prayers, nor Sacrifice to be used for the dead. By Sozomenus l. 5. c. 20. and Eusebius l. 7. C. 14. To forbid with Julian the Apostate, the use of Images, and Sign of the Cross. by S. Hierome l. contr. Helvidianum. To equal marriage with Virginity. By the same S. Hierom l. contr. Vigilant. To say with Vigilantius, Saints are not to be Invoked, nor their Relicks to be honoured. By S. Hierome again, l. 3. contr. Pelagian. To brag as the Pelagians did, that they were sure of their Salvation

Salvation. By S. Augustine to say with Jovinian That such as are regenerate by Baptism, and once received in Gods grace and favour cannot finally fall away. By S. Hierome contr. Vigilant. To say Churchmen ought to marry. By S. Cyril in Epist. ad Calo-syrium Episc. of Madnets as well as Error. To say with some in these dayes, Christs body did not remain in the Eucharist, if it were kept untill the morrow. By S. Augustine l. 6. contra Julian. C. 2. & 3. and ad Bonifac. C. 2. & 4. To say with the Pelagians, That the children of the Faithful are born holy, and need no Regeneration by Baptism. By S. Augustine l. de heres. C. 54. To teach with the Eunomians, A man is saved by Faith only. By S. Augustine l. 1. C. 2. & ult. contra Maximin. To deny Apostolical Traditions in the Church. By S. Cyprian Ep. 55. to say with most Hereticks, To Peters Chair and the Principal Church, Infidelity or false Doctrine can have access. By Irenaus l. 3. C. 3. to deny all Churches round about ought to resort to the Roman Church, by reason of her more powerful Principality, By all the Fathers in the Council of Calcedon Act. 16. To deny that all Primacy and chief Honour is to be kept for the Archbishop of Old Rome. So that the Protestant Religion is not only void of all Solid Ground either in the Divine Scriptures, or Holy Fathers, but also in most clear and expresse words

words is condemned as Heretical by both. It being indeed nothing but a new Heresie, patcht up of many old condemned Errours, joyned to some fresh Notions and Conceits, flowing from the same Spring and Spirit of Pride and Rebellion against all the Antient Fathers and present Pastors of the Church; Its frequent changes, show it is not from God: Its Monstrous Divisions in so many Sects, that it has not the Unity of Faith: Its inconstancy in Principles, Tenets, Form of Worship and Government, that it is not built upon the Rock, and consequently hath no solid Foundation or Ground.

Con-

as
tu
Ch
Sec
ons
fo
day
flow
true
rou
selv
end
P
Here
thor
dence

*Conclusion of all that has been said,
wherein also the true Grounds
of the Catholick Religion are
set down.*

A Little Error in the beginning, turns great in the end, sayes the Prince of Philosophers *Aristotle* in his Physicks: which as it is most true in the first Principles of all Natural Sciences, so it is in the Grounds of the Christian Faith. The innumerable by-ways of Sectaries, their monstrous and manifold Divisions from the true Church & amongst themselves, so many Controversies among Christians in our days, such wranglings and jars for Religion, flow all from one Spring, to wit, The mistake of true Principles and Grounds. And this one Error in the beginning, makes them run themselves in so many, and infinite great in the end.

Pride and Contention (the two Pillars of Heresie) will let them acknowledge no Authority of Councils or Fathers, yield to no evidence of Reason, submit to no Judge. Whence

M

Con-

Controversies are driven to nothing, but idle and endless Contentions and Quarrels: Councils are called Conventiles when they sentence or censure them; the Church is changed into a Synagogue; the Fathers forfeit their credit; places, and passages from Scripture, are applyed or misapplyed as they list; Now a jeer, now a jest in handsome Language (which jovial and jeering humours most look upon) are their common Answers to solid Reasons: Evidence in Motives of credibility is mocked at: Faiths certainty is changed into probability: a few Fundamentals comprehending chief Mysteries (what or how many they cannot tel) are judg'd only necessary to be believed; Errors in Integrals (as they call them) which make the greatest part of Christian Doctrine, are taught to be things indifferent to our belief: In them even the Apostles were not in allible, say *Rainolds* and *Whitaker*, with some other Protestant Divines; In them the whole Church may err, says *M. Menzeis*; and upon this, as if she had erred, come in all Sectaries to reform her: she is old, and her Spirits exhausted; they have the fulness of the Spirit: her Eyes by age are dimmed, she sees not what is manifest in Scripture, they as younger see clear: she is too Superstitious in her Religious Ceremonies, they as more familiar with God use none: like Prophets Extraordinarily sent by God, they preach against Priests and people: they

they set out a New Gospel of their own, as if they were Apostles and Evangelists, finding no true Scripture before : Yea as if they had Christs own power, they abandon the Antient Church as the Synagogue, and make up a new one, changing both the Priesthood and Sacrifice : No more penances and satisfactions of men to Gods Justice for their offences, because Christ hath satisfied for all : No more fasting, except very seldom, and that only for temporal ends : No good Works are left in our power, they are too hard, yea impossible, seeing even our best actions are sins, Faith only justifieth ; and to believe is an easie task : So the strait path is made plain, and the narrow way broad to them : Whil'st others strive to work their salvation with fear and trembling, chastizing their bodies with the Apostle *S. Paul*, *least they become reprobates* ; They live secure, that each of them is one of the Elect, making even this an Article of his Faith. And this they perswade to simple ones with some refined words, uttered in the tune of the *Sybilles*, giving responses from the belly, so far they are fetched with a deep sigh, as if they breathed nothing but zeal : some more Learned, relying on the acuteness of their wits, go willingly along with them, not to captivate their understandings, or submit to any Visible Judg, ~~making~~ men of interest comply outwardly with the prevailing party, keeping

their own retentions of mind; and this it is which their Preachers for the most part desire of us, that we would but comply in hearing, that is, believe one thing, and force our Consciences to profess another. Come hear us say they, and you shall not be troubled, we seek no more, and of their most understanding bearers they get no more, as I have often heard from themselves. We are not (say they) so Proud and Arrogant as Papists, to call our Church and her Doctrine Infallible, the Scripture is only so: By it judg of us and what we teach, as you your selves read and understand: This is the liberty of the children of God, to be tyed to no Churches Faith, to no Councels Decrees, to no Fathers Doctrine: The Word as clear in it self, or explained by it self; the Spirit speaking inwardly in our hearts, and every mans Natural Reason directed by certain Rules for the right understanding of both, is the only means God hath left for the conversion of Infidels, conviction of Hereticks, and settling of every good Christian in his belief. O Liberty, Liberty and Freedom of the children of God, from the Popes Supremacy, Councels, Infallible Authority, the Churches Jurisdiction in matters of Faith and Religion, and generally the usurped power of any Visible Judg.

This is M. *Menzies*, and Protestants great Principle, (which as I have demonstratively I hope

hope above proved) makes all our Debates in Religion, and takes away all certainty in Faith.

But because to ruine Protestant Grounds, and give no better in their place, were rather to destroy then edifie, to throw down then to build, and in a Controversie of Religion, rather to set up Atheism, then root out Heresie, (as M. Menzeis continually cavilling at our Tenets, but never once settling his own, with so much labor hath done) I therefore do here for a Conclusion briefly ~~have~~ set down, and clearly prove solid, the Grounds of the Catholick Faith.

The Ground then of true Faith and Religion Established by Christ and his Apostles, not only solid and infallible in it self, but also clear and perspicuous to all, yet special and particular to us in Communion with the Sea of Rome, to which no Sectary, Schismatick, or Heretick doth or can pretend; removing all Doubts, deciding all Controversies, silencing all sowers of false Doctrine and Errours, keeping Unity, stopping Divisions, quieting mens Consciences, instructing the Ignorant, settling the Unstable, captivating the understanding of the most Learned to the obedience of Faith, and which the greatest and quickest wits of the Christian World, (that is all the holy Fathers) have ever built their faith upon; *Is Scripture and Apostolical Tradition conserved in the Church, as delivered*

expounded by her, both as an infallible Propounder and Judge. Whence if any man here ask the Analyſie and reſolution of our Faith? I answer him in a very few words: We believe ſuch things as are from Scripture, and Apoſtolicall Tradition taught in the Church, to be true, becauſe God hath revealed them: The reaſon again why we believe God did reveal ſuch things is, for that we ſee evident Motives of credibility in this Church, and none elſe, wherein God ſhows himſelf Author of her Doctrine, confirming it with diſverſe infallible Marks, and chiefly Miracles, which manifeſtly appear both his Subſcription and Seal. *Digitus Dei hic eſt*, Pharaoh's Magicians could not but acknowledge this, *Exod.* the 8. *v.* 19. Seeing only the Duſt of the Earth ſuddenly by Aaron changed into Vermin, they cryed out, *The hand of God is here*: So that there be two things to be remarked in the Reſolution of Divine Faith. The firſt is, God revealing, *Deus revelans*: And the ſecond is, God ſhowing himſelf Authour of ſuch a Revelation; *Deus proponens ſe authorem revelationis*, ſay the Divines. What God hath revealed, is taught us by his Church as an infallible Propounder; that he is Author of the Revelations made to her, he attests in the Motives of credibility, as infallible marks, that it is he who ſpeaks: So all in our Faith is infallibly from God, and all infallibly propounded to us. The things re-
vealed

vealed by the true and infallible Church; and the Revelation by infallible Motives, which being clear to all who have Eyes, Ears, and Understanding, make evidently credible, and infallibly certain all and every one Point of our Religion and Faith.

Now to prove what I have set down, to be the only true solid and infallible Grounds, of the true Christian and Catholick Faith. 1. That Scripture is this Ground, is granted by M. Menzeis, and all Protestants, so needs no proof as to them. 2. That sole Scripture without the Declaration and Exposition of the Church, as an infallible Propounder, Expounder, and Judge, cannot be this Ground, is proved at length in my fourth Section, and presently you shall see it again. 3. That Apostolical Traditions are necessarily joyned with Scripture; Is 1. proved from clear Scriptures, most expressly commanding us to receive them, *2 Thes. 2. 13. Therefore brethren stand fast, and hold the Traditions which ye have been taught, whether by word, or by Epistle. 2 Thess. 3. 6. Now I command you brethren in the name of our Lord Jesus Christ, that ye withdraw your selves from every Brother that walketh disorderly, and not after the Traditions which he received. 1 Corinth. 11. 2. Remember me in all things, and keep the Traditions as I delivered them to you.* 2. By the Authority of the Fathers of the first three ages quoted in my

sixth Section, with that of *S. Chrysostome*, *S. Augustine* and others above mentioned. 3. From manifest and Demonstrative reason, in some chief Points which all Christians believe without any express Scripture, as I have instanced in persons in the Trinity, Sacraments in the Church, the keeping of Sunday, &c. and in many Heresies condemned by the Church, Councils, Fathers, yea and Protestants themselves, without any clear Scripture can be brought against them: as *S. Augustine* avoucheth of the Errour of *Donatists*, &c.

Rests then only to prove that the Church's Authority as an infallible Propounder is necessary, to make all these Divine and infallible Truths in themselves, contained either in Scripture, or delivered by Apostolical Tradition, both solid and infallible Grounds to us.

For this I presuppose, 1. From the Apostle *S. Paul*, *Hebrews 11. That without Faith it is impossible to please God.* 2. From the same Apostle, *Ephes. 4. 5. That there is but one Faith, one Baptism, one Lord JESUS Christ.* 3. From him again, *Hebr. 10. 23. That we must hold fast the profession of our Faith without wavering.* From which Texts, importing the Necessity of Faith, the Unity of Faith, and the steadiness in believing required in Divine Faith, it doth follow that some infallible means which all may make use of, must be appointed by God to attain to this

this Faith so absolutely necessary to all. For to say God hath commanded us, and that under the pain of Eternal Damnation, to believe undoubtedly, and not furnished infallible means to attain to such belief, were to accuse his Goodness, Providence, and Wisdom. And this no Christian or rational man will deny, so that all the Question that can be moved, is about the infallible means to attain without doubt or wavering to Divine Faith, which may persuade infallibly all sort of persons, that such things are revealed by God, removing all reasonable doubts that can arise, either concerning Gods Revelation (which is the formal object of Faith) or the things he hath revealed (which makes its material Object) and this means I say again, must not only be solid and infallible objectively and in it self (as M. Menzen will have the Protestant Religion and Grounds of it) but also subjectively, and to us, it being the same thing, as to make a persuasive motive, not to appear, and not to be, according to that Maxim, *Idem est non esse & non apparere*. Wherefore a ground however infallible in it self, yet not appearing so to us, and known to be such availeth nothing as to our belief. The Mathematicians Demonstrate, the Sun to be many times greater then the Earth, and their Demonstration no doubt is both certain and evident in it self, yet never shall persuade a Country clown that it

is greater then his Cap, for that no Demonstration of this is clear and certain to him. Even so is it in the Ground of Faith, it must be both solid and infallible in it self, and it must be known to be such by all who prudently rely upon it.

This presupposed, to conclude all that has been said, and fully prove both the Ground of Faith in the Catholick Roman Church, solid as the Rock it is built on, and the means for conveying it to us infallible; I first show against M. Menzeis, or rather for him and his conversion, the necessity of an infallible Propounder of what we must undoubtedly believe (for if this can be made good, he engageth again to turn Papist) 1. That the true Church is this infallible Propounder. 2. That the Catholick Roman Church is the only true Church. 1. Then as to the necessity of an infallible Propounder: If no man, nor Church be infallible in propounding, then nothing by Scripture, and consequently all that is contained in it, is only delivered to us by fallible means, and so no infallible certainty in Faith. The consequence is clear, for most infallible Truths may be changed, altered, corrupted, and both fallibly and falsely propounded to us, as the first and chief Mysteries of the Christian Religion by Hereticks have been. 2. Faith comes of hearing, says the Apostle then as there be infallible believers and hearers, so must there be infallible Teach-

Teachers, for Hearing and Teaching are Contributives. 3. No other infallible means is, or can be assigned by Protestants to Ignorants, yea to all who understand not the Original Languages, for what is contained in Scripture, save only the Authority of the Pastors and Church, but this Authority in propounding is not acknowledged infallible by them, then no infallible means is left. 4. There is no less necessity the Church be infallible in propounding, then the Evangelists in penning, and the Apostles in Breaching, no disparity can be given, Gods Word being equally infallible in it self before both, as it is now. 5. Our Saviour Christ most expressly owns the necessity of an infallible propounder, granting the Jews had not sinned in refusing to believe him, if by his Works and Wonders he had not evidenced himself to be the Son of God, and consequently infallible in his Doctrine. 6. For this, the gift of Miracles is given to the Apostles, and left in the Church, to show their infallible assistance in propounding. If you answer that was necessary at first, but not now, because it is the same Doctrine you teach, which the Apostles did propound infallibly: You say nothing, for that it is we doubt of, or rather undoubtedly we deny, that your Doctrine is the same. You presently appeal to Scripture, but in vain, till first you answer to all that is objected in my fourth Section, how ye know infallibly

fallibly what ye call Scripture to be Gods Word, then the Letter you read to be uncorrupted, the sense you give to the genuine, &c. and to all the clear places of Scripture I have brought against most of your particular Tenets. I do not here ask ye to prove that to be infallibly Gods Word which was preached by the Apostles, this they did sufficiently themselves: Neither that the Doctrine of Authentick Scripture is infallibly true, (that was also done before there was a Protestant in the world) but coming from those Generals (which make all the Answers of your best Writers) we desire ye shew by some infallible sign that your Bible is Gods pure Word, and your Glosses on it conform to the Sense and Letter. To reply, Scripture doth evidence it self by its innate light to be Gods Word, so that all may sufficiently know it by this, and all be obliged to believe it, is refuted by Christ himself, presently telling us his own hearers had not sinned in not receiving it as such, if he had given no External Evidence of his infallibility in propounding; for as I have remarked above, Scripture hath no greater Efficacy, Evidence, or Light in our Books, then in our blessed Saviours own mouth. Neither will the Majesty of the Style, or the purity of the Doctrine do it, both these being as great in the the Books of *Wisdom* and *Ecclesiasticus*, which Protestants reject, as in the *Ecclesiastes* and *Canticles*,

icles, which they receive. Besides that the first of these two is imaginary, as to the Letter, there being less Majesty in the Letter of Scripture, than in the Philosophers and Orators Writings, as is confessed by *Paul*. And the second is in question chiefly in Protestant Bibles, which do not agree with any Original or Copy that before *Luther* can be found, if we trust their own Authours whom I have quoted.

Lastly, If all Councils, all the Fathers, all the Pastors of the Church be fallible, then let Protestants bring nothing but Scripture against us, (for we will receive nothing but upon infallible Authority) and all their Volumes of Controversie shall not come to one line. Yea further, could they bring Scripture for what they teach (as they will never be able to do) yet without an infallible Propounder and Judge, well might we dispute, but conclude nothing, wrangle, but agree in nothing to the Worlds end. For as sole Scripture without an infallible Church propounding, and Explaining it, so a naked Church without infallible Marks, and a Doctrine without infallible Motives, prove nothing.

Secondly, I say the true Church is this infallible propounder, on whose Authority we must rely. For proof of this, It is to be observed, that in holy Scripture there be three Foundations or Grounds of Faith mentioned by

by the Apostle S. Paul. The 1. Is our blessed Saviour Christ, 1 Cor. 3. 11. *Another Foundation no man can lay then that is laid, which is Jesus Christ.* The 2. Is the Apostles and Prophets, Ephes. 2. 20. *Built upon the Foundation of Apostles and Prophets.* The 3. The Church, 1 Tim. 3. *The house of God, which is the Church of the living God, the Pillar and Ground of Truth.*

From which clear places of Scripture, I remark, 1. The Foundation of Faith is ever a Living, Visible, and Speaking Ground, to wit, Christ, the Apostles, Prophets, and Church, the dead Letter of Scripture being no where called this Ground. 2. That these three Grounds of Faith, both in the Old and New Law, properly speaking make but one, according to the same Apostle, *for another Foundation no man can lay, says he, beside Christ JESUS.* So that the Prophets, Apostles, and Church must not be thought different Foundations from Christ, all their Vertue in upholding Faith, and Veracity in propounding Faith (Whence they are called the Foundation and Ground of it) coming from the particular assistance of his Spirit, Strengthening, Inspiring, and Directing them. Hence also is their infallibility, for *the Foundation of Christ stands sure*, says the Apostle, 1 Tim. 3. 19. And consequently is altogether infallible. 3. That the Church here
called

called a Ground which supporteth our Faith, is not to be said the only diffusive body of all true Believers, but more the Representative Church in her chief Pastors, as the Prophets and Apostles in old. Wherefore some few Catholick Authors so often objected, as holding the Canons and Decrees of Councils only infallible, when they are generally received by the whole Church; in my opinion are highly mistaken, and surely to be understood (if any in Express terms speaks so) of Councils not wholly Occumenical, or not Lawfully convoked, and known-ly approved by the Pope, or whereof some rational doubt may be made in things essentially required; in which cases I grant the general belief of the Church could best warrant the infallibility of their Decrees. Otherwise a few particular persons might cope with General Councils, as *Luther* and his Adherents at first, Vendicating to himself the Negative voice, as if he had been high Bishop in the whole Church; which were to take away all possible means of preserving Unity in Faith, yea to foment all Schisms and Divisions, every one pretending the whole Church holds no such Doctrine; whilst he who is a Member dissents. So that such Doctors if they should allow no obligation in receiving the Decrees of the Representative Church, to the which they do and must submit even this their Sentence, could neither
be

be thought Catholicks or rational men.

But however some few speak or think, God did promise us an infallible Church, *Isa. 2. V. 293. Wherein he should teach us his ways, and judge amongst the Nations himself*, not personally, for he never went out of Jewry, but by her Pastors. He has establish'd this infallible Church, in *St. Matth. 16. V. 19. Upon the Rock. Christ hath commanded us to hear her, in St. Matth. 18. V. 17. And the persons we should hear in this Church, as well as the end wherefore we would hear them, and rest upon their Authority, is clearly set down in these words, 4. Ephes. 11. He gave some Apostles, some Prophets, some Evangelists, some Pastors and Teachers, for perfecting of the Saints, for the work of the Ministry, till we all come in the Union of Faith, that we henceforth be no more children tossed to and fro, and carried about with every wind of Doctrine, &c.* From all which places of Scripture, it is Demonstratively manifest, that as the true Church is infallible, and we bound to hear her, yea and to rely upon her Authority, as the Pillar and Ground of our Faith, so is it most evidently clear, that as she speaketh only to us infallibly by the voice of her Pastors and teachers united, it is them we should hear, seeing God in her, (not personally as I have said, but by them) both Judgeth and Teacheth, as the infallible Propounders of his Divine Truths. (with the

Pro:

Prophets and Apostles in old) and the infal-
 lible Judges of our Controversies and De-
 bates.

2. The same is proven from the unanimous
 consent of the Fathers, quoted at length in my
 third Section, for the infallibility both of the
 Church and Councils; And may be confirmed
 even by the confession of many Rational and Mo-
 derate Protestants, who receive the Scripture,
 and consequently all, and every Point contained
 in it, as the Word of God, upon the sole Au-
 thority of the Church; As M. Whitaker against
 Stapleton, p. 1. c. 11. I deny not but the Churches
 Tradition is the Argument whereby to convince
 what Books are Canonical and what not. M. Fulk
 in his Answer to a Counterfeit Catholick; The Church
 hath judgment to discern the Word of God from the
 Writings of Men. M. Cowel in his defence of Hoo-
 ker, Doubtless it is a tolerable Opinion of the Church
 of Rome, to affirm, that the Scriptures are holy
 in themselves, but so esteemed of us for the Au-
 thority of the Church. And M. Hooker in his Ec-
 clelesiastical Policy, we all know that the first out-
 ward Motive leading men so to esteem of Scripture,
 is the Authority of the Church. And as these own
 her Authority in Propounding the Scripture
 Books, so other Protestants in resolving all
 Doubts, and deciding all Debates; as Bancroft
 Lord Archbishop of Canterbury, in his Sermon on
 the 8. of February 1588. God, says he, hath bound

himself to his Church of purpose, that men by her direction might in matters of doubt be relieved, he speaks of the Representative Church, which onely directeth. Master Field in the Epistle to his Treatise of the Church; Seeing the Controversies of Religion are grown in number so many, and in Nature so Intricate, that few have time and leisure, fewer strength of understanding to examine them; what remaineth for men desirous of satisfaction in things of such consequence, but diligently to search out, which among all the Societies of men in the World, is that blessed company of holy ones, that household of Faith, that Spouse of Christ, and Church of the living God, the Pillar and Ground of Truth, that so they may embrace her Communion, follow her Doctrine, and rest in her judgement? Here again the Representative Church both Judging and Teaching. M. Hooker in the Preface of his Books of Ecclesiastical Policy: We are right sure of this, that Nature, Scripture, and Experience have taught the World to seek for the ending of Contentions; by submitting it self to some judicial and definitive sentence, whereunto neither part that contendeth, may under any pretence refuse to submit. And what is this but a General Council? M. Bilson in his perpetual Government is clear for it; To have no Judge, sayes he, for the ending of Ecclesiastical Contentions were the utter subversion of all peace. Synods are surest means to decide doubts. Sr. Edwin Sands in his Re-
lation

lation of the Religion used in the West parts of the World. The Protestants are as severed and scattered Troops, each drawing a diverse way without any means to take up their Controversies, &c. No ordinary way to Assemble a General Council of their part, which is the only hope remaining ever to asuage their Contentions.

3. Reason evinceth it: The true Church is the School of infallible and Divine Truths, then she must have infallible Masters and Propounders. A fallible Church is most properly named by a Learned Writer, a Spiritual cheat; it may well be called the Ground of Opinion, Doubt and Despair, but not of Infallible and Divine Faith. If the Sheep hearing the voice of their Pastors, and following them be misled, who shall be their sure Guide? And if all the Fathers, and Doctors of the Church together assembled, may mistake either the uncorrupted Letter, or true sense of Scripture, who I pray you can assure himself he takes it aright? No infallibility in matters of Faith and Religion is left upon Earth; the high Bishop and chief Pastors of the Church unanimously Teaching and Propounding, cannot err; It were more then madness any man should say the contrary, and yet hold himself infallibly secure of what he believes.

Would a Protestant be but once at the pains to speak to an Infidel for his conversion to the true Church, calling all her Pastors, even assem-

bled in a Council fallible : I should willingly hear what he could so much as say in general for Protestantcy, yes or for the Christian Religion. No doubt he should first speak of one true God, then of Christ and Faith in him, as necessary to salvation, telling his Profelyte, how out of his Goodness and Mercy towards us, he had made himself Man, and died upon the Cross for our sins ; Yet afterwards had risen again, and by his Miracles, shoven both his Civinity and Power, and by these strange Works and Wonders, having established his Church, he had delivered his Will and Doctrine to her in his Written Word, called the Holy Scripture. Upon this, the Infidel no little astonished at such a Discourse, surely should ask him some Ground for it, and how he could be perswaded it were true? Here I imagine the Bible is produced, as the Word of God, and sole ground of Faith : But who assures me of this, says the infidel? It was attested by many Miracles which Christ and the Apostles did work, who first preached it, Answers the Protestant, they were holy men, chosen by our Saviour Christ, for the conversion of the World : they did Teach his Word Infalibly ; They did set it down in Writing, confirmed it with Wonders, and left it to the Church. How long ago replies the Infidel? Nigh 1700. years answers again the Protestant. One Question more, says the Infidel, have you any

any infallible Witnes in your Church; or any Infallible External Motive; that this is the same Word of God that was Preached by the Apostles; and delivered by Christ; or that in confirmation of it, ever any Miracle was wrought? The first needs none, says the Protestant, it is clear to all well disposed persons; turn Protestant and you will Evidently see it to be the Word of God; and the second is sufficiently attested in it. Presently the Infidel having received further instruction in most Points of Protestantism, and made more earnest to see how all that has been taught him, is true; desires he may have for a time the Bible; and diligently perusing it, finds some things in the Historical Books, look like Fables, many more in the Prophets he doth not understand; many seeming contradictions betwixt the two Testaments, many points he was taught by his Protestant Master, not in Scripture at all, yea many things clearly against it. Of all which he asks his Master a diligent account; And first whether at present there be no man, or company of men can resolve him infallibly of all these doubts? None; concludes the Protestant but Scripture is self; for since the Apostles there is in the Church no Judge, no Propounder infallible. If so, Sir, you conclude nothing with me, says the Infidel, but here I end with you, for the Book you ground all you have laid upon, as if it were clear

clear and infallible to me, like the first Principles in our Philosophers Schools, is so deeply obscure, and highly above the reach of reason, that without some powerful motive and inducement, no reasonable man can believe it. And since you grant it was at first propounded with infallible Motives which now have ceased, It seems God would have it believed no more. For who can prudently believe things not clear in themselves, or at least not so to us, without some infallible Propounder evidencing by Supernatural Motives (as Miracles) that such a Doctrine is from God? Neither can a Protestant standing to his Principles say any more, whence no conversion of Infidels amongst them.

But no end of their cavelling with us. They here urge, I Suppose the true Church were infallible in her Pastors assembled in a Council; yet all we bring in proof of this, may be retorted against our private Teachers, who are not infallible in propounding. But to this it is easily answered, that as God most infallibly, both by his general Providence, and particular Promise directs, rules, and governs his Church; so he by virtue of his special assistance oversees infallibly her private persons, in order to our certainty in Faith. For in the holy Hierarchy of the Church, God hath placed Watchmen most vigilant over their flocks, who suffer them not to be misled; they have discovered the very least Errors, sown

in Corners, and branded their Authors as false Teachers. Wherefore as unity in belief is the Form and Soul of that great body of the Catholick or Universal Church, so whatever Doctrine is commonly taught and received in her without any contradiction from her Pastors, is sufficiently known to be infallible.

2. They object there is no infallible Propounder of this Article of our Faith; *The Church is Infallible*, Answer, Yes, 1. God shows himself the Propounder of this in the Markes of the Church, which we shall presently see. 2. As our Saviour Christ calling himself the Son of God, and working Miracles, did sufficiently, yea, infallibly evidence to the *Jews*, that it was true what he said: So the Church calling herself infallible, and working the like Miracles in all Ages, doth infallibly evidence to the world that it is true what she says, otherwise it would follow that God did employ his Omnipotency and Power to work Miracles in favour of an Impostor, thus cheating the world with a lye.

3. Therefore I say, the Catholick Roman Church, is the only true Church, in which the Doctrine of Christ is infallibly propounded, and certainty in Faith and Salvation to be found. This Point is of highest concern according to the Fathers, For, *it is only the Catholick Church, says Lactantius, l. 4. that hath the true Worship and Service of God: That is, the Well-spring of Truth*

Truth, the dwelling place of Faith, the Temple of God, into which, whosoever entereth not, and from which, whosoever departeth, is without all hope of Life and Salvation. Whosoever is divided from her, says S. Augustine in his Epistle, 152. how laudable soever he seems to himself to live, for this only crime, that he is separated from the unity of Christ, he shall be excluded from life, and the wrath of God shall remain upon him. And again in his 50. Epistle, as a Member cut off wants the spirit of life, so a man separated from the body of Christ, cannot have the spirit of Justice, &c. They have not the Holy Ghost who are out of the Church. S. Cyprian de Unitat. Eccl. The Spouse of Christ cannot be defiled with adultery, whosoever divided from this Church cleaveth to the Adulterers, he is separated from the Promises of the Church, he cannot have God for his Father, who hath not the Church to his Mother. S. Irenaeus l. 3. C. 40. in the Church God hath constituted Apostles, Prophets, Doctors, and all the rest of the Operation of the Spirit, whereof those are not partakers who repara not unto the Church, where the Church is, there is the Spirit of God. Vincentius Lyrinensis, contr. haeres. C. 1. & 2. says, That he having very often most diligently inquired of many Holy and Learned men, how he might certainly distinguish the true Catholick Faith from all Heresies, it was ever answered him by the Law of God, and the Tradition of the Church,

Church; *Divina legis auctoritate & Catholica ecclesie traditione.* Then making to himself the common Objection of Protestants, seeing the Rule of Scripture is perfect, what necessity of joyning to it the Tradition of the Church? He presently Answers, because all take not Scripture one way, and in the same sense, because of its deepness. All the Fathers run upon this, out of the Catholick Church, no true Religion, no Divine Faith, no infallible Guide, no sure way to Salvation, no hope of Heaven, no means to attain Eternal Happiness and Life. - Wherefore God by his Divine Appointment, Order, and Decree having eyed us, and ~~that~~ under no less pain then the damnation of our Souls to live in the Unity and Communion of this Church, in which only he has placed the Chair of his Doctrine, and Channels of his Graces. I presuppose, 1. This Church may be easily known, and that by clear Marks in all Ages, and by all, she being so amply great, and Eminently high, that the Prophet *Isa. Ch. 2.* calls her, *The Mountain of the Lords house established in the top of Mountains, and exalted above the Hills, which all Nations should flow to.* That those Marks be the same now, which did evidence her in Christs, and in the Apostles time: for all things are best conserved by the same means by which they received their being, says the Philosophers, *Conservatio continuata productio.* 2. That

9. That whatever Church is found to have these Marks, should be undoubtedly acknowledged for the true one, otherwise they could not have proved her the true Church at first.

This presupposed, that the Catholick Roman Church is the only true Church. I most evidently prove in short (if for this hath been often done in large volumes) and that by a very few undoubted Signes, and as it were most legible Characters of the Primitive Church in the time of the Apostles, paralleling the one with the other.

Three things are chiefly remarkable in the Apostles, and Church under them. 1. Their Sanctity and Holiness of Life. 2. The great conversion of Infidels wrought by them. 3. Their manifold and wonderful Miracles. These be the Marks of their mission, by which they show themselves to be the servants of God, to be sent by God, and that God by his Vertue and Power concurreth and cooperateth with them. Their Holy, Humble, Poor, and Auster Life, makes them like to their Master Christ, and fit instruments for the great Employment they are going about: Miracles make their Credential Letters, and witness the fulness of their power. Conversions are the end of their Embassy, which as it was to last till all the Nations of the earth were brought to the Unity of Faith, and bosome of the Church,

Church, according to that Promise of Christ,
There shall be one Shepherd, and one Fold, so their
 true Successors are constantly known by the
 same Signs in all Ages, as the undoubted Marks
 and Badge of the Apostles.

I begin at Miracles, which I call the Apostles
 Credentials, and make the chief infallible Mark
 of the true Church, and all infallibly credible
 which is taught in her, as the great Seal God
 sets to her Doctrine. In the first Age, the Mi-
 racles of the Apostles and Disciples are set
 down in holy Scripture, so need no other Testi-
 mony. In the second Age, *Justin Martyr* *quest.*
28. reporteth many wrought by the bodies, and
 at the Sepulchers of Martyrs, and *Irenaeus* *l. 2.*
c. 58. innumerable others for the conversion of
 the *Gentiles*. In the third Age many most great
 ones are wrought by *S. Gregory* surnamed *Thau-*
maturge, or worker of Miracles, related by *S. Gre-*
gory *Nissen* in his Life, and *S. Basil de sp. sancto* *c.*
29. divers whereof by the Sign of the Cross. *S.*
Cyprian *serm. de laps.* relates with many others,
 three very strange Miracles in this Age, confirm-
 ing the Real Presence. In the fourth Age, a
 dead body is restored to Life by the holy Cross,
 when it was first found by the Empress *Helen*,
 as witness *Ruffinus*, *Nicophorus* and others. Ma-
 ny other Miracles are wrought by Reliques, wit-
 nessed by *S. Chrysostome*, *orat. contr. gentes*, by ho-
 ly Water attested by *S. Epiphanius*, *har. 30.* by

Adoration of Christ in the Sacrament; witness
S. Gregory Nazianzen *orat. 11.* by Prayer to our
 Lady, says the same Authour, in *S. Cyprian*,
 by the Merits of Martyrs, as relateth *S. Ambrose*
Serm. 21. In the fifth Age, *S. Augustine* l. 22
de civit. c. 8. many by the Reliques of *S. Stephen*,
 and an hostle dispossessed of Devils by saying
 of Mass; *S. Chrysostome* ^{hom. 33. in matth.} by the sign of the
 holy Cross. *Eusebius* *Cremen.* writes, *S. Hiero-*
some being dead, the blind, deaf, dumb, and sick
 were cured by touching and kissing his Corps.
 In the sixth Age, Miracles are wrought to con-
 firm the Sacrifice of the Mass, witness *S. Grego-*
ry l. 4. dial. C. 57. by the Reliques of *S. Martin*
 as is related by *S. Gregory* of *Tours*, *de Miraculis*
S. Martini l. 1. c. 11. Two others says *S. Gregory*,
 l. 3. dial. C. 3. by *John* the first, and *Agapitus*,
 both Popes. In the seventh Age, we have Mi-
 racles in defence of vowed Virginity, related by
Sigibart, ap. 670. wrought by Reliques, in *Beke*,
 l. 5. c. 11. By the Images of *S. Anastasius*, at the very
 sight, wherof Devils fled, and diseases were cu-
 red, in *act. 2. Synod. Nicen.* In the eighth Age,
 divers Miracles are wrought at the translation of
S. Augustines Reliques from *Sardinia* to *Ticinum*,
 by *Luisprand* King of the *Longobards*, after he
 had redeemed it with a great sum of money
 from the *Sarazens*, witness *Olderici* *Ep. ad Car-*
ol. Magn. A Crucifix in the City of *Berith*, stab-
 bed by the *Feme*, bleedeth, and the blood cureth
 all

all diseases, witness *Crantius* with the *Magdeburgians* Cen. 8. In the same age Pope *Leo* the third, having his tongue cut, and his Eyes pulled out by the *Pagans*, had them both restored by the Intercession of *S. Peter*, as it is Recorded by *Anastafius*, *Baronius*, and many others. In the ninth Age, innumerable Miracles are done at the Tomb of *S. James*, and by a Picture of *S. John Baptist*, related by *Curopatates*, *Baronius*, and other most approved Authors, as also most famous Miracles of three Popes, *Stephen* the fifth, *Paschalis* the first, and *Formosus*. In the tenth Age by *S. Romuald*, and *S. Dunstan* to be seen in *Surius*, *Baronius*, &c. by touching *S. Peters* Chains in *Sigibert*, an. 965. In the approbation of the single life of Priests, and the exemplary punishment of them who opposed it; see for this *Matthew of Westminster*, an. 975. And *Osbert* in the life of *S. Dunstan*. In the eleventh Age, by three Popes, *Leo* the 9. *Victor* the 2. and *Gregory* the 7. the Authors you have in *Baronius*, who with him confirm them. By *S. Edward* King of *England*, for which see *Alredus* in his life; by *S. Anselme* Bishop, *S. Odilo* Abbot, *S. Chune-gunde* Virgine, related by *Surius* and other Writers of their lives. In the twelfth Age, the Miracles of *S. Malachy*, Apostle of *Ireland*, are recounted by *S. Bernard* (whom even *Calvin* calls a holy man) one whereof confirmeth Extreme Unction, and another the Real Presence. Many like

likewise are to be seen in the Life of *S. Bernard* himself, and one most notable in confirmation of the whole Catholick Roman Faith. In the thirteenth Age, we have the many famous Miracles of *S. Dominic*, *S. Francis of Assisium*, *S. Antony of Padua*, *S. Louis of France*, *S. Celestine Pope*, and *S. Clare* witnessed by *S. Antonine*, *S. Bonaventura*, *Petrus Cardin. Cameracensis*, *Baronius* and others; all most renowned Writers. In the fourteenth Age, the Miracles of *S. Nicholas Tolentine*, *S. Bach*, *S. Katherin of Siena*, are Chronicled by *S. Antonine*, *Surius*, *Baronius*, &c. In the fifteenth Age, *S. Antonine* 3. par. hist. tit. 23. testifieth thirty eight dead persons to have been restored to life, by the Prayers and Merits of *S. Vincent*. Many sick are also cured by the Intercession of our blessed Lady, at her house in *Loreto*, and the Turkish Army terrified by Miracles from sickning it, as Reports *Tursellin* l. 2. hist. Laur. In the sixteenth Age, many great Miracles done by *S. Francis of Paula*, *S. Ignatius of Loyola*, and *S. Teresa* are Authentickly proved in the process of Canonization, and the Authours of their lives. In the same Age, *S. Francis Xavier*, called commonly the Apostle of *Japone*, and the first Jesuit sent to the *Indies*, raiseth four from death, and worketh innumerable other Miracles, attested by the Viceroyes, Governours, Prelates, Pastors, and people of those Countries; in which it is reported he Baptized about twelve hundred thousand

said souls with his own hand. Some moderate Protestants even honour his memory, and make mention of his admirable Conversions, and if others should deny his Miracles, we might come to that *S. Augustine* calls the greatest of all, to wit, that he should have converted so many, and wrought none.

Many thousand more Miracles are recorded in the Writings of the Fathers in all Ages, in the Monuments of the Church, yea, and in the Histories of each particular Christian Nation; as in *France*, that famous apparition of our Saviour Christ in the Consecrate Host at *Paris*, in the time of King *Louys* the 9, to which were eye witnesses, most inhabitants of that great City: In *Spain*, that miraculous Cross placed on the Altar by an Angel, at the conversion of a King of the *Moors*, desirous to hear Mass, which is kept in the Town of *Caravaca*, and worketh Miracles to this day. In *Italy*, the wonderful Translation of that holy house wherein our blessed Saviour lived at *Nazareth*, to *Loreto*, at which so many Miracles have been wrought by the Intercession of our Lady, and attested by so great Gifts and Offerings, that of a mean Cottage, it is now the richest Chappel in the World. In *Flanders*, the miraculous cures at our Ladies Chappels of *Hall* and *Sirchem*, written in two Books, by that Famous and Learned Authour *Justus Lipsius*, and of which he giveth
this

this Testimony in his first Chapter; Behold things done in the Eyes of us all, behold them celebrated with the Concourse, Applause, Fruit and Benefit of whole Countreys; what trash can there be in Humane Affairs, if no credit be given to these things? In Poland, that most notorious Miracle of a man raised to life after he had been seven years dead, and brought before the King sitting in Justice, to witness he had sold such a piece of Land to the Church. In England we have from their Best Authors, how in a publick Assembly the opposers of a single life in Priests are all smothered under the ruines of the room, only S. Dunstan and those who with him defended it, being miraculously preserved; where also the many Miracles of S. Winefride, Virgin, to the great good and constant cure of the multitude having recourse to her Chappel and Fountain, continue even in our days. In Scotland, a Miracle makes the armes of one of our chief Cities, others of S. Mungo, S. Fiaker, S. Margaret, &c. are famous in our Chronicles, yea the ever continued Miracles in many places consecrated in old time to God and his Saints, make the people as yet to frequent the very rubbish and ruines of our Chappels.

Now to reflect a little upon what I have said.
1. The Miracles I here speak of, are for the most part the same, or like to those which Christ and his Apostles did, as the suddain cure
of

of naturally incurable Diseases, the raising of the Dead, the casting out of Devils, &c.

2. They have been done in all Ages, in the Catholick Roman Church, and in no other.

3. The Workers of them, are Popes, Bishops, Priests, Eremites, Monks, Fryars, Jesuits, and others, all knowingly opposers of Protestancy; all living in Communion with the Sea of Rome.

4. They are witnessed by the most Learned, Judicious, and Vertuous Witnesses of the Christian World, yea are so notoriously Evident, that Hereticks cannot but avouch them, with the Centurists of *Magdeburg* and others.

5. Many of them are not only Personal Miracles, Witnessing the holiness of the Person that Worketh them (as these which serve for the Canonization of our Saints) but also Dogmatical, confirming our Doctrine against Protestants, as being wrought by Reliques and Invocation of Saints, the Sign of the holy Cross, holy Water, saying of Mass, Exorcisms, Pilgrimages to holy Chappels of our blessed Lady and other Saints; by real Apparitions of our Saviour Christ in form of a Man in the Consecrate Host, &c.

What then can Protestants Answer with any show of Probability, to this first Mark of the Catholick Roman Church? Shall they grant a false Religion to have so many Miracles, and theirs which is the true, to have none? or shall

O

Christ

Christs promise in *S. Iohn Ch. 14.* made to faithfull Believers prove false, that Protestancy may at least seem to be true? They will rather deny these Miracles which I have brought, and all others since the Apostles, for their Negative Faith Engageth them ever to a strong Denial, as all their New Religion is but a denying of most Antient and known Christian Truths; Yet shall any man upon their bold denial distrust such a croud of so Famous Witnesses, and Writers? Shall they say many Miracles have been fained? so some Gospels; but what maketh that more against these of the Catholick Roman Church, then those of Christ and his Apostles? What has not been counterfeited? Gold, Silver, Jewels, Wines, doth it follow there be none true, or that no man can distinguish things Sophisticated from pure and real? Could not *S. Iustin*, *S. Irenaeus*, *S. Chrysostome*, *S. Basile*, and *S. Augustine*, relating so many done by Reliques, and Invocation of Saints, judge of true ones? Or were *S. Athanasius*, and *S. Hieron*, relating the Miracles of *S. Anthony*, *S. Gregory of Nisse*, and *S. Basile*, those of *S. Gregory Thaumaturgus*, *Severus Sulpitius*, and *S. Gregory of Tours*, those of *S. Martin*, *Theodore*, those of *S. Nicolas*, *S. Gregory the great*, those of *S. Bennet*, *S. Bonaventure*, those of *S. Francis*, so easily deceived? Shall they deny the Workers of such Miracles, to have been Members of the Roman Church, or them to have been wrought in Confirmation of the

the present Romish Faith? But it is by saying of Mass, making the sign of the Cross, Invocating of Saints, honouring of Reliques, they have been done. Shall they have recourse in fine to the false Miracles of Infidels, Hereticks, Magicians, the Antichrist or Devil? So did the *Arians*, *Eunomians*, and other Hereticks, as reports *S. Ambrose* in his Sermon of *S. Gervase* and *Prothase*, *S. Hierome* against *Vigilantius*, and *Victor Uticensis* in his second Book of the persecution of the *Wandales*, and is the same the *Jews* did say to Christ, but more then either Men or Devils can do. All those things which Hereticks, or Infidels have done, or that Antichrist shall do, being but like these of *Pharaoh's* Magicians, little curious Trifles of a short lasting; and that may proceed from Natural Causes: But so are not the Miracles I speak of, for they are the very same with those of Christ and his Apostles; they are attested by the holy Fathers and Doctors of the Church, who could best judge of true and real ones; and as they have been wrought in the Catholick Roman Church, and in her only in all Ages, so in every Age have they brought in some Nation of Infidels to the bosome of the same Church.

This is the second thing remarkable in the Apostles, and no less Conspicuous in the Catholick Roman Church. Whosoever then desires to see this second Mark of the true Church veri-

fyed in the Church of Rome, let him observe the following

fied in the Roman Church: Let him but cast an Eye over all the Nations which were ever converted from Infidelity to Christianity since the Apostles, and then but take a view in their respective Histories and Records, who were their Apostles? out of which Church they were sent, and to which Church they did at first bring in their Profelytes and Converts. And he shall find all this great Work to have been done by no other then Popes, Bishops, Priests, and Religious men, all living in Communion with the Roman Church, all acknowledging her Headship over other Churches, all teaching her Doctrine, all submitting to her Authority, and all propagating her Faith. See for this in general, the Theater of the Conversion of all Nations, Written by *Mermannius*, and the History of the Church by *Baronius*, and *Spondanus*, ^{all} in particular, the Records of each Nation, yea and the *Magdeburgian* Centurists, though Protestants: It being so notoriously evident, that even our adversaries cannot deny it, and if they should, the very Walls of Churches, Chappels, Monasteries, adorned with Croffes, Statues, Images, and other marks of the present Roman Religion, might sufficiently prove it against them. Pope *Alexander* the 1. is glorious for the conversion of so many of the Roman Senators and Nobles: Pope *Sylvester*, for that of the first Christian Emperour *Constantine* the great, the *Bulgarians* are converted by Pope *Nicolas* the 1. the *Bohemians* by

Stephen

Stephen the 7. Norway by Adrian the 4. the Pommeranians by Nicolas the 3. all Popes, S. Eucherius Pope, sends to this our Island two of his Clergy, who convert King Lucius and his Subjects; Scotland owes its conversion to Pope Victor by his Envoys and Legates; Ireland to Pope Celestine, who sent thither S. Patrick; England to S. Augustine sent by S. Gregory the great: Clovis first Christian King of France is converted by S. Remigius Bishop of Rheims; the Franconians by S. Willibrod; the Thuringians, Haffits, and a great part of Germany, by S. Boniface; the Flemings by Eligius; the Danes and Swedes by Ansgarius; the Slavonians and Hungarians by the two Adalberts; the Polonians by Egidius, Tschellanus sent by Pope John the 13. run thus through all the other Kingdomes and Pfovineses of the Christian World, you shall constantly find the same: And this as in all former Ages, so in ours; witness the Conversions of the Japonians, Indians, Brasilians, Mexicans, Peruvians, Canadas, Algonquins, and many other Savage Nations in America, the Coasts of Afric, and remotest corners of the Earth, where the Catholick Roman Church ever like to her self in the Primitive times, and her Pastors and Preachers to the Apostles, continue their Labours to this day, with such success by the blessings of God, that they have converted ten to the Christian Faith, for one Protestants have perverted.

But what Kingdom, Province, or Town did ever Protestantcy enter in, which it did not find Catholick? Never so many Sects of Hereticks, yet not one goes to convert Infidels, all their business is with Papists, and all their Forces employed against the Roman Church, a clear Demonstration she is the only true Church, so generally opposed by them all. But whatever they can do is in vain, shee being built on the Rock, against which all the Powers of Hell shall not prevail. Their Disputes serve for nothing but to clear her Doctrine, their Controversies but to confirm her Faith, their Persecutions but to Crown her sufferings, their unchristian Maxims against the Evangelical Counsels of voluntary Poverty, vowed Chastity, and a retired, humble, devote, austere, and obedient life, but to make more gloriously appear, the incomparable Sanctity, Holiness, and Vertues of her Saints.

And this is the third thing remarkable in the Apostles and Primitive Christians, which in all following Ages hath so gloriously shined in the Catholick Roman Church, their exemplary holiness in following Christ by renouncing to the World, living chaste, condemning both Riches and Pleasures, their holy hatred of themselves, the hardship of their travels, and labours for the conversion of others, their continual Fasting, and frequent Prayer. This Mark of the Churches Sanctity is set down in the Creed, *I be-*

lieve

lieve the holy Catholick Church : It is confirmed by Authority of Scripture, *S. Paul* in the beginning of all his Epistles almost, calling the Churches to which he writes, *holy*, as in that to the *Romans*, *Corinthians*, *Ephesians*, *Philippians*, and *Colossians*, as *S. Peter* calls the Church generally *the holy Nation*, it is also Visible to all, as the goodness of a Tree is seen by the Fruit, so the holiness of the Church, by her Works.

Now let us see in what Church the greatest Lights of the Christian Religion have shined? what Church hath most Monuments of Christian piety? in what Church, the Examples of Christ and his Apostles, have been most narrowly followed? Who have built most glorious and goodly Edifices of Churches to the honour and for the Service of God; who so many Monasteries to harbour his more devoted Servants; who so many Hospitals for the poor? who best Evidenced true Faith by good Works? who have most put in practice all the hardest Maxims of the Gospel? who taken greatest pains for the Salvation of Souls? who shown greatest love towards God, and greatest charity to their neighbour? whether Papists giving so liberally to God and his Church, or Protestants taking back what they had given? *By their Fruits ye shall know them*, says our Saviour Christ, our actions give testimony of our Faith. The holy Fathers writing so many Lives of our Saints, witness enough their unparallel'd piety, yea and God

himself working so many Miracles by them, How many Princes and Monarches in the Catholick Roman Church, have laid down their Crowns at the foot of the Cross, have quitted Kingdoms, renounced pleasures, forsaken the World, taking themselves to a poor, humble, mortified, and austere life? how many thousands, yea millions of Eremites, Monks, and other Religious persons, men and women have totally consecrated their lives to the service of God? No Age, no Order, no degree of Persons in this Church wanteth most Eminent men in Sanctity and Holiness. Above 30. Popes have been all most glorious Martyrs, besides many more Saints, as our *Gregories*, *Leo's*, *Celestines*, &c. our holy Bishops are in number above the Stars of the firmament, and our Priests and Religious like the Sand of the Sea: *S. Henry* Emperour, *S. Lewis* K. of *France*, *S. Edward* King of *England*, *S. Malcolme* and *S. David* Kings of *Scotland*, with *S. Helena* Mother to *Constantine* the great, *S. Margaret*, *S. Cunegund*, *S. Elizabeth*, and many others all Kings and Queens, have shown the Sanctity of our Monarchs. See the holy Court, and History of the Church for the holiness of so many amongst the Nobility and Gentry, and the Lives of our Saints, and Writings of the Fathers, for the eminent virtues of innumerable others both amongst the Gentry and Commons. *S. Chrysostome*, *S. Ambrose*, *S. Augustine*, *S. Bernard*, and other

other holy Fathers having honoured their Memory, and Festival days with most Eloquent Sermons in their praise, as God by his Omnipotency and Power, hath sealed their sanctity with undoubted Miracles, both in their Lives, and in their Deaths.

What can all the Sectaries which have ever been, shew like to this, or what can they say against it? Shall it be that all are not Saints even amongst our most Austere Religious men? but neither were all Saints amongst the Apostles; and the Primitive Church even in their time wanted not its scandals, which sheweth it was not only composed of the Elect: the total separation of the good from the bad, is not the work of men now, but of the Angels at the last day; till then as the Tares grow up in the best Fields of Corn, so shall there be ever many wicked and scandalous in the true Church. But out of it, no Saints, no safety for sinners, no Sacraments that sanctifie, no means of reconciliation with God.

I insist not here any further on the other Marks of the true Church, as their Antiquity, Universality, Unity, and the very name of Catholic, which are to be found at length verified of the Roman Church, in many whole and large Volumes. No other Church having ever been generally called by this name, or known under it, but all by their private Denominations, as the *Arians*, *Pelagians*, *Eutychians*, *Macedonians*, &c.

in Old, so the Lutherians and Calvinists now. And if we call this Catholick or Universal Church also the Roman Church, we speak with S. Paul, calling the Catholick Faith spread through the whole world, theirs. No other Church having constantly appeared visible in her Pastors and people by a continued succession from the Apostles, which held S. Augustine in her *Tenet me in Ecclesia*, says he, *Successio facendum*. I am holden in the Church by the succession of Priests, then he reckons out the only high Priests and Bishops of Rome as the lawful Successors of S. Peter, as in his 162. Epistle, he says, in the Roman Church has ever been the Authority of the Apostolick See. *In ecclesia Romana semper Apostolica Cathedra viguit auctoritas*. No other having unity in Faith, or the means to preserve it by General Councils, which have all been holden in her. No other, and specially the Protestant Church, having either Universality or Antiquity, as is clear from their late Rise, and little Extent.

Whatever Protestants and other Sectaries sophistically or Subtily Object against all this, is but weak, and should stumble none, many stronger Objections, *Atheists, Infidels, and Hereticks* have made against God, our Saviour Christ, and the holy Scripture. The first Principles most clear by the light of Nature, suffer their Objections, who are the Scepticks among Philosophers, as the

Socinians amongst *Hereticks*, those admitting of nothing as unquestionably clear, and these as infallibly true.

Wherefore to conclude all, I have said: the Catholick Roman Church being so gloriously marked, so generally attested, and so notoriously known to be the true Church established by Christ and his Apostles, ever conspicuous and visible, ever working Miracles, converting Infidels, making Saints, ever holding Councils, deciding controversies, keeping unity, opposing *Hereticks*, and maintaining true Faith upon Solid and Infallible Grounds, having so clear testimony from the Fathers, from Scripture, from God, having *charisma veritatis certum*, the Gift and Grace of certain and infallible Truth, says *S. Irenaeus*, *origines firmas*, sure beginnings saith *Tertullian*, *Veritatem in de quaque muniam*, verity solidly grounded, and guarded, says *S. Epiphanius*, *hanc*, *et auctoritatem stabilissimam*, most solid and constant Authority, says *S. Augustine*, *Ep. 28* may not say justly with our Countryman *Richard of St. Victor*, *l. 1. c. 2. de Trium. c. 2. Si error est quem credimus a se despicimus*. If it be Error we do believe (in this Church, and upon her Authority) it is then (O God) who hath deceived us, for with such signs this Doctrine is confirmed, that it can be from no other but thee.

Let the impartial Reader here compare both Protestant Grounds and Doctrine with ours, and

and see, after all their Objections and Cavils, what they bring for their new, doubtful, and inconstant Opinions, against our old infallible and constant Faith: what against our just claim, our clear right, our long and uninterrupted possession. They come in with the Scripture in hand, as the Fundamental Law against which there can be no prescription, but what Scripture, I pray you, save that they have wrested from us? *olim possideo, prior possideo*, says Tertullian, it was first delivered to us; we have it of old, and we conserve it whole and entire. But not so Protestants; the many Books they reject shows it is but like a torn bond in their hands, blotted in as many places, as there be things put in of new, or others rased out in their Bibles. And then as they bring it, it is altogether forceless, and can make no security as a rent Charter without Subscription, Witnesses, or Seal. Gods Subscription would be seen and acknowledged if it were presented by them, as at first by the Apostles with Supernatural ~~Motives~~ Motives: witnesses, if they could show it passed down from age to age by infallible Propounders; his Seal in Miracles. But the Protestant Church granting her self to be fallible, and being destitute both of infallible Motives of credibility and miracles, can be no sure propounder of Gods Word, neither can it as propounded by her, be any sure ground to us?

Yea

Yea, Examine well all the Principles Protestants build their Pretended Reformation upon, and you shall find them all nearly Whimsical, Paradoxical, and improbable. For what Probability can there be, 1. Of what they say against us, that the Popish Church (as they call it) which they grant to be most antient, should have continued so long, and ever possessed the greatest part of the Christian World holding Councils, condemning Heresies, converting Infidels, working Miracles, and that the Protestant Church which they will have to be the Catholick or Universal, all this time was no where to be found, never once made mention of by any Author; without Councils, Statutes, or Laws published to the World; never converting one Kingdom, opposing one Heresie, having one Writer of note witnessing her Faith and Doctrine, her doings or sufferings, her Pastors or People: That the antient Congregation diffused through the whole World, should be Heretical, and the new one in some few corners be Orthodox: That corruption of Doctrine did enter so insensibly into the Roman Church, that no Councils, no Fathers did see or censure it, who have observed many lesser things in private men; that all the Fathers I have quoted in my 6. Section, should have unanimously holden ever since the Apostles, what Protestants call Popish Errors, or that so many Learned men in the Roman Church, who have dived into the very depth
of

of most abstract Sciences, could not see before *Luther*, what in Scripture was clear.

2. What probability for what they vent of their first Apostles and Reformers? that God did send one Apostate Friar, (who in the Monastery as he confesseth lived so mortified, chaste, and devote, but quitting it, is so hurried with his passions of Lust, and stings of Conscience even for this his new Doctrine, as may be seen in the Preface of his Works in Latine, and his Table Conferences) without any visible mark of his Mission, to reform both his Word and Church, in opposition to all her ordinary Pastors at that time: that the Church before him (I mean *Luther*) as he himself glories, should have been destitute of the true Letter and sense of Scripture, of true Worship, true form of Government, &c. that notwithstanding so many solemn promises made by God, the Word should not depart out of the mouths of Pastors, nor the true Church be so much as obscured, yet that Christ should have suffered the light of the Gospel to be under a Bushel, and the Church invisible for more then a thousand years: That his Reformation should be the work of God, and the world ever worse since it: That Protestancy should bring back true Faith, which is divided into so many Heresies, and has caused so many Troubles, Divisions and Schisms.

3. What show of probability or solidity in
Pro-

restant grounds? that the ground of Faith (which
 they will have to be sole Scripture as every one
 reads, and understands) should support all the
 Heresies in the World: That this Ground gi-
 ven us for keeping of Unity, should make all
 our Divisions in Religion: To deny the Autho-
 rity and Tradition of the Church infallible, and
 yet take Scripture on it; that the whole Repre-
 sentative Church in a General Council is not in-
 fallible in its Decrees, and yet private men read-
 ing Scripture are infallible in what they believe:
 That what was at the Margent in their first Bibles,
 would be now put in the Text: That pure Scrip-
 ture should be a cleer Ground for Protestancy,
 and not one Point specifical, or special to it,
 to be found in Scripture in expresse words: In
 fine, that Protestants should have the pure
 Word, and rely on the Originals; their best
 Writers granting they have not found so much
 as an Authentick Copy any where.

If you will see what probability at last they
 have either for their Doctrine or Church, consi-
 der amongst Protestants (with the Author of a
 late Answer in Writ) *Faith without Unity, a Bo-
 dy without united Members, a Law without a
 Judge, a Church without an Altar, Religion with-
 out a Sacrifice, Sacraments that do not sanctifie,
 Divine Service without Religious Ceremonies,
 Preachers without a call, Doctrine without Infallibi-
 lity, Belief without a ground; Commands impossible*

to be kept, Exhortation to what is not in our power;
 Reward without Merit, Reprobation without demerit,
 Sin punished where there is no free will, new Apostles
 without Mission or Miracles, Reformation without
 Authority, the private Spirit against the whole
 Church, new Lights against old revealed Verities,
 single mens Opinions against the common consent of
 the Fathers, Scripture received or rejected upon the
 Catalogue of the Jews; in a word, wavering Pastors,
 unsettled Government, unstable Faith.

FINIS.

THE NEW YORK PUBLIC LIBRARY
ASTOR LENOX TILDEN FOUNDATION
500 FIFTH AVENUE
NEW YORK, N. Y. 10017